

JAN 29 1931

VOLUME XXVI

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

NUMBER 1

*January 1931*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER  
CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON JENNINGS LAING  
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH  
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*  
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*  
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*  
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*  
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXVI

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1931

No. 1

The First Publication of Horace's Odes	By G. L. Hendrickson	1
The Status of Actors at Rome	By Tenney Frank	11
Valerius Flaccus in the Mediaeval <i>Florilegia</i>	By B. L. Ullman	21
Lucius Arruntius	By Robert Samuel Rogers	31
The Historical Tenses and Their Functions in Latin	By John J. Schlicher	46
The Lupercalia in the Fifth Century	By William M. Green	60
The Spartan Gymnopaedia	By Benjamin D. Meritt	70
Notes and Discussions		85

P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON: *St. Chrysostom's Use of Josephus*.—CLARENCE A. FORBES: *Antigymnasiarch in Strabo and in a Locrian Inscription*.—PAUL SHOREY: *Note on Plato *Parmenides* 129-30*.—DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN: *The Biography of Cicero in a 1491 Edition of Plutarch's  *Lives** .—R. E. GLANVILLE DOWNEY: *The "Pure" Meadow*.

## Book Reviews

THOMAS: *Mélanges Paul Thomas: Recueil de mémoires concernant la philologie classique* (Shorey).—MILLER (ed.): *Selections from the Brief Mention of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve* (Shorey).—DREERUP: *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart, im Rahmen einer allgemeinen Geschichte des griechischen Unterrichts* (Costas).—FRIEDLÄNDER: *Die Platonischen Schriften* (Shorey).—TACKABERRY: *Luctan's Relation to Plato and the Post-Aristotelian Philosophy* (Shorey).—SMITH: *The Original "Iliad": The Solution of the Homeric Question* (Scott).—STREIBER: *The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome* (Wilson).—WOODHOUSE: *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey* (Shorey).—FALLIS: *The 2 Rhapsody of the "Iliad"* (Bolling).—FRÜBER: *Die Caesurenfolgen des letzten Bearbeiters im Homer als Spuren seiner Compositions-kunst* (Bassett).—SANDERS (ed.): *Beati in Apocalypsin, Libri Duodecim* (Goodspeed).—ROBSON: *Arrian: with an English Translation* (Lowe).—DEWING: *Procopius: with an English Translation* (Lowe).—CART: *Dio's Roman History: with an English Translation* (Lowe).—KRISTOFERSON (ed.): *Declamatio in L. Sergium Catilinam* (Ullman).—VALENTINI (ed.): *Johannis Antonii Campani de vita et gentis Bractii* (Ullman).—BRISTON: *Maphaeus Vegius and His Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid* (Ullman).—HEMPF: *Mediterranean Studies: I. The Genesis of European Alphabetic Writing; II. Minoan Seals* (Ullman).—RIPMAN: *A Handbook of the Latin Language* (Shorey).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 3750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa, Balesic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

### The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 19s. 2d. each; single copies, including postage, 6s. 4d. each.

For Japan: THE MARUZEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Paoshan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this Journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

AN

consistency

No. 1

1  
11  
21  
31  
46  
60  
70  
85

98

y of  
ear;  
stage  
blic  
ica,  
nde,  
and  
ries  
are  
fts.

ssa,  
ud-

des,  
ata.  
ub-  
bok

as-

and

12.  
on





# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXVI

JANUARY 1931

Number 1

## THE FIRST PUBLICATION OF HORACE'S ODES

By G. L. HENDRICKSON

IT IS apparently the general assumption of Horatian criticism that the three books of the *Odes* were published together for the first time in or near the year 23, and that no collection had preceded that publication. But while it is certain that the three books in their final form constitute a unit, framed as they are between the prefatory hope

quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres,

and the triumphant fulfilment

lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam,

yet it is by no means equally certain that no preliminary *libellus* had introduced the poet to a Roman audience as an aspirant for honors of a different type from those he had already earned as satirist and iambist. The only ground for this conclusion is the absence of evidence of any such intermediate collection between the book of *Epodes* and the three books of *Odes*. But the silence of our fragmentary record on such a point is wholly without significance. If we were to judge rather by the analogy of other practice, and by the earlier usage of Horace himself,<sup>1</sup> we should conclude rather that first publication of the three volumes as a whole was less probable than the intermediate publication of one or more collections of lyrical poems.<sup>2</sup> Whatever evidence there

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the first book of Horace's *Sermones*, the original *libellus* of Catullus, the *Eclogues* of Virgil, the first book of Tibullus' *Elegies*, the first book of Propertius.

<sup>2</sup> I note that Heinze in the recent—and unhappily posthumous—paper, "Der Zyklus der Römeroden," has suggested cautiously that the series iii, 1–6 was published first in the year 27 (*Neue Jhbb.*, V [1929], 687).

is on this point can only be derived from the poems themselves. In the nature of things it cannot be compelling, at best only suggestive, and valuable, if at all, only for the light which, as an hypothesis, it may cast upon the interpretation of particular poems.

First of all there is the very distinct epilogue ii, 20, which has given rise to such dissent as exists from the prevailing theory of complete publication at one time. It would be absurd to suppose, indeed scarcely conceivable, that this poem was composed for any other purpose than to mark an absolute end to the immediate collection of verses of which it formed the conclusion. When it first appeared it could not reasonably have been followed by another book as it is now. In its conception of death and transformation to an immortal bird of song it is more final even than iii, 30. It has been variously suggested that this poem is an experiment in the composition of an ultimate epilogue to the three books, but yielded to the superior inspiration of the one which now holds that place. But any such notion is improbable from the fact that neither in conception nor in metrical form does it show any corresponsion with the prologue i, 1. Our poem is certainly an epilogue in its own right. No less certainly is iii, 30. Both for the time of writing are conceived of as final. But from its form and from its echo of sentiment iii, 30 is the complement of i, 1. Therefore it would seem a probable conclusion that when the *Alcaics* of ii, 20 were composed as an epilogue to some collection of lyrics, the introductory *Asclepiadeans* of i, 1 were not yet in existence,—that in short our collection of three books had not yet been formed.

It would seem then that ii, 20 must have been the epilogue to an earlier collection. Without embarking on a hazardous voyage of conjecture we cannot at this time say much more of this collection than that it did not contain the present prologue i, 1, which looks beyond our poem. If then we are right in discerning in ii, 20 a poem, which for its time and occasion must be looked upon as concluding a series, we may venture the further inquiry whether there are still in the *Odes* any traces of poems which might have served as introductory to an earlier collection or collections.

i, 32

One there is which will occur immediately to Horatian readers, the prelude-like character of which has long been recognized—

Poscimur. Si quid vacui sub umbra  
 lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum  
 vivat et plures, age dic Latinum,  
 barbite, carmen.

To all that has been said of this poem as a proemium I would only add what earlier students (obsessed apparently by the conviction that our three books of *Odes* in their present form represent the first publication of any of them) have failed to urge, viz. that this poem seems to me to have precise and sharp meaning only if we think of it as having been written in the first instance to stand at the beginning of a first collection of lyrics. The lyre is bidden to sing a Latin song, since—with arrogance which success has condoned—it had never before essayed measures other than Greek. It is the same vaunt that Horace, with neglect of Catullus and doubtless others, has made elsewhere. The *carmen Latinum* is the poetry which is to follow, not a specific poem or group (like the so-called “Roman odes” at the beginning of book three), but a body of miscellaneous poems in part identical with, or analogous to, the “Aeolic song,” which later (iii, 30) he boasts to have been the first to transfer to Latin measures. In harmony with this conception is the opening word *poscimur*. It gives the motive and occasion for the publication. Horace had already written lyrics which had been circulated among his friends, and the demand must have often assailed him to make them public before he himself was ready: *poscebatur enim dicta sua edere*, is the comment of the pseudo-Acronian scholia. It would be natural to think of pressure from Maecenas, whose earlier and later importunity Horace resisted. Horace’s whole attitude from his *Epodes* (14, 4) to his latest *Epistles* (Augustus, Florus) was one of reluctant compliance with the wishes of his friends to put forth his compositions, and this attitude—or pose if you like—is here suggested in *poscimur*.<sup>1</sup>

#### i, 16

We are now equipped with a possible prologue and a certain epilogue to a postulated earlier collection, and enough is as good as a feast. Nevertheless I venture to go a step further and claim another poem of the first book for the category of prefatory compositions, without

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Serm.* i, 4, 73: *nec recito cuiquam nisi amicis idque coactus*.

venturing to assign it to a specific place. But I am less concerned with actual reconstruction, the limitations of which I recognize, than with interpretation, and indeed my whole suggestion of an earlier collection is merely an hypothesis for furnishing a setting or background to the explanation of certain poems. The second poem in question is the familiar sixteenth of the first book—*O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*.

Although so far as I know this is a conception of the composition which has not before been advanced, yet I fancy that the mere statement of it will suggest the essential reason for this point of view. The ode on the face of it is an injunction to a nameless fair one to destroy ruthlessly certain abusive iambics. There follows then a description of anger and its baleful consequences drawn with a touch of playful extravagance. The concluding moral bids the lady to restrain her wrath—*compesce mentem*—while the poet confesses that he too in the hotness of youth had been driven to writing swift iambics. But now he would change from harshness and bitterness to gentler words, and having recanted his abuse begs that she may become his friend. The peculiarity of this argument lies in the fact that the poet does not confess present or recent cause for provoking the lady's anger, but products of youthful indiscretion, the same iambics which she is bidden to destroy. Their shafts were directed perhaps against the mother; the daughter still cherishes a pious resentment. In technique the poem is noteworthy for the absence of the name of the one addressed. We should of course in accordance with the poet's ordinary usage look for one of the familiar pseudonyms, a Cinara or Lydia or Pyrrha.<sup>1</sup> But perhaps there was a reason for the omission.

Considerations such as these have led me to suspect that the significance of our poem is masked beneath a slight and almost transparent allegory. The iambics which are to be destroyed are the verses of his youth, those earlier epodes which reveal that *fervor pectoris* which he here deprecates. They are the *tristia* which he now proposes to exchange for gentler words—*mitia*. And these gentler word—what are they but songs of love and wine and pastoral life, in short a collection of odes which these words are meant to introduce? The *matre*

<sup>1</sup> "Die Ode scheint, wie die auffällige Verschweigung des Namens vermuten lässt, ein echtes Gelegenheitsgedicht zu sein: etwa an Cinara? oder wäre die ganze Situation lediglich erfunden um den irasci celer Horatius die Voraussetzungen für eine lyrische Verwünschung des Zornes zu schaffen?" (Heinze-Kießling).



*pulchra filia pulchrior* is the audience of to-day, "the fair reader"—child of that earlier audience which had listened to and been the victim of his earlier rage and abusiveness. She is nameless: to have given her a name would have robbed the poem of its universality and have misled the reader to find the specific where the general was intended.

It is not difficult to see how Horace should have hit on this conceit. For the dozen years or more that he had enjoyed fame as a poet his reputation to the Roman world rested exclusively upon *Iambi* (Epodes) or *Satires*. The very names of these types of verse would serve to brand him as a man of venom and wrath: *rabies armavit iambo*, as Archilochus is described, or *laedere gaudes et hoc studio facis*, as the critic of *Sat.* 1, 4 taunts him. Of what use to protest his innocence and kindness so long as he wrote in these forms? For his friends and intimates the softening of earlier bitterness and the assertion of natural gentleness in a friendly atmosphere were well known. But with what eyes would the public receive a new volume of poems from one whom they had learned to fear and suspect?

cum sibi quisque timet quamquam est intactus et odit.

When accordingly he put together a first or early collection of verses in a new and totally different vein he felt the need, we may conjecture, not merely to invoke the lyre to sing now at length a Latin song, but also to mark the difference in spirit between these verses and his earlier writing. To this end he chose the conceit which I have suggested, which for lack of a more sympathetic name I call allegory. For its past debauches allegory is paying the penalty with a bad name, and enjoys few present friends. But to symbolize in concrete terms something which belongs in the realm of fancy, whether we call it allegory figure conceit or what not, belongs to the very essence of all poetry. Particularly in reference to themselves and to their own works have the poets employed a language more or less cryptic: as when Browning pays homage to his wife's genius in the address, "All that I know of a certain star," or when Tennyson replies to his critics in the familiar fable, "Once in a golden hour I cast to earth a seed." Similarly Horace in the epilogue to the second book of *Odes*, referred to above, portraying his imminent metamorphosis and immortality, and in the conclusion of the first book of *Epistles*, in which his book is addressed

as a wilful house-born slave eager to escape from the restraints of home and master.

The particular form of the allegory here invoked was yielded by reminiscences of the famous palinode of Stesichorus, imitation of which the pseudo-Acronian scholia assume (*imitatus Stesichorum poetam Siculum*). To be sure modern criticism is almost unanimously sceptical of the existence of any such relationship. Kiessling-Heinze deny it roundly, and others seem only to suggest that the idea of a palinode may have been derived from the familiar poem, acquaintance with which Horace reveals in the last epode. However I find it hard to believe that in a composition of professed recantation (*recantatis opprobriis*) words which describe so exactly the relation of Leda and Helen should not have some connection of imitation or adaptation with the famous prototype. The three verses quoted by Plato in the Phaedrus,

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος  
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν ναυσὶν εὐσέλμοις  
οὐδ' ἔκειο πέργαμα Τροίας,

are perhaps from the very opening of the Palinode ("haud dubie sunt ipsum exordium carminis nobilissimi"—Bergk), but the address to Helen is wanting. Exactly what it was we cannot say, but one might not unreasonably conjecture that Horace's *o matre pulchra filia pulchrior* is the Latin rendering of it. More than once Horace begins a poem with a literal transcription from a Greek source to suggest similarity of emotional key, and then proceeds to a development quite independent, as in i, 37 *νῦν χρὴ μεθύσθην*—*nunc est bibendum*.<sup>1</sup> But even more suggestive of relationship to Stesichorus is the deprecation of anger, since the occasion of the Palinode was the word brought to the poet that his blindness was caused by the wrath of Helen (ὥς ἡ διαφθορά τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐξ Ἑλένης γένοιτο αὐτῷ μνημέματος, Pausanias III, 19 extr.). The appeal, *compesce mentem*, which as Kiessling observes occasions surprise in Horace, would have been most natural in Stesichorus, and may have influenced its presence here. The conclusion of the ode (*fias amica . . . reddas amicum*) is a plea to his new

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Norden, *Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, Part 4, p. 57: "Seine Praxis war Motive zu entlehnen, die mottoartig an den Anfang gestellt und dann mehr oder minder selbständig ausgeführt wurden."

audience for a friendly and benevolent hearing, reminiscent of the *captatio benevolentiae* of a Terentian prologue, following on earlier disfavor and failure:

voluntas vostra si ad poetam accesserit,  
date operam, adest aequo animo, etc.

i, 17

The ode immediately following, and in the same metrical form,—*Velox amoenum*—is addressed to a certain Tyndaris, an invitation to share the peaceful pastoral life of the poet. Porphyrio<sup>1</sup> (or some earlier source) by inference from this name assumed that the *filia pulchrior* of the preceding poem was this same Tyndaris, basing this conclusion apparently upon the assumed relationship of i, 16 with the Palinode of Stesichorus. Modern criticism has been for the most part wholly sceptical of this identification, seeing in it only a confusion with the patronymic of Helen, the Tyndarid.<sup>2</sup> With this view I would quite agree. Yet while it would be quite without reason to carry back the name of Tyndaris to the preceding poem and identify her with the one there addressed anonymously, it is nevertheless conceivable that Horace, composing the two poems in succession, and even thinking of them in some sense as complementary, should have chosen the name Tyndaris from the suggestion of his own phrase, modeled upon the address of Stesichorus to Helen. As for the name, it does not seem to appear elsewhere in a literary context except in allusion to Helen. As a female proper name Pape lists one or two examples. However, that it might not be unsuited to the rôle of a bucolic heroine may be illustrated by one of the stories of the "invention" of bucolic poetry preserved among ancient or Byzantine prolegomena to Theocritus (Ahrens, II, 4): τὰ βουκολικά φασιν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ εὐρεθῆναι . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν Τυνδαρίδι τῆς Σικελίας πρῶτον ἀχθῆναι λέγουσι τὰ βουκολικά.

If it be true that the name owes its suggestion to the preceding poem, we should be justified in suspecting that the two compositions

<sup>1</sup> In his opening comment on 1, 16: *Tyndaridi amicae suae*, and again by implication at the beginning of 1, 17: *et haec ode ad Tyndaridem scribitur*. Several MSS carry the superscription to 1, 16: *ad Tyndaridem*.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Sturtevant seeks to rehabilitate it in *Class. Rev.*, XXVI (1912), 119. He also emphasizes the suggestion of relationship in the sequence of two odes in the same metre.

in other respects stand in some relation to each other. Such a relationship was assumed, as we have seen, by Porphyrio, but with false assumption of identity in the one addressed. I should rather be tempted to think of the seventeenth, with its atmosphere of rural peace as a designed illustration of that gentler vein which the poet professes in contrast to earlier harshness and cruelty—*nunc ego mitibus mutare quaero tristia*. In this sense it would constitute a part of his new program, or proemium.

Characteristic of Horace's mastery of lyrical technique is his fondness for invading nearly every other field of poetical composition with his Aeolic measures. For apart from themes of purely lyrical type, in harmony with the traditions of the older Greek lyric, we find essays in the domain of the Alexandrine elegy, the Hellenistic epigram, philosophical parenesis, the mime, the pastoral, etc. To the latter class, the pastoral, our ode belongs. It may be called, in Browning's usage, a dramatic lyric, since for the poet to portray himself as a shepherd, luring even Pan from Arcady by the music of his pipe as he tends his goats and kids, can scarcely be said to fit literally even the rustivating Horace. And the invitation to Tyndaris? Is she the usual courtesan of the city—a Pyrrha, a Barine or Asterie? Is she not rather to be thought of as a shepherdess of the countryside, whom the shepherd-Horace seeks to win from a rival swain of like condition with himself? The type is too familiar in pastoral poetry to require more than suggestive illustration. Marlowe has made it familiar in English with his "Come live with me and be my love." The amorous shepherd vaunts his superior skill in song which even the great Pan comes to hear; he protests his own innocence and constancy, sets forth the abundance of his store, and pledges a life of peace and contentment with him, in contrast with the violence of the lover who now holds her favor. To all of these motifs it would be easy to adduce parallels from Theocritus (the third idyll, for example), from Virgil (Corydon's wooing of Alexis), from Calpurnius (Lycidas and Phyllis in the third eclogue).<sup>1</sup>

But there is a detail of interpretation upon which rests in some measure the conception of our poem thus set forth. Why does Faunus

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Calpurnius, *l.c.*, v. 53 ff., and for the violence of the rival v. 30, *diduxi tunicas et pectora nuda cecidi*.



leave his familiar haunt in Arcadia to visit Lucretilis, and by his presence protect the poet's flock? In the usual explanation no reason is apparent except the general favor of the god. His coming has however a specific motivation, which the poet has obscured by a slightly anacoluthic or asyndetic structure.

Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem  
mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam  
defendit aestatem capellis  
usque meis pluviosque ventos—  
impune tutum per nemus arbutos  
quaerunt latentis et thyma deviae  
olentis uxores mariti  
nec viridis metuunt colubras  
nec Martialis haediliae lupos  
utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula  
valles et Vsticae cubantis  
levia personuere saxa.

Editors have been wrong, I believe, in placing a full stop at the end of the first stanza. The simple continuity of sentence structure is to be sure broken by the change of subject (*mutat, defendit—quaerunt, metuunt*), but it is held together by the correlation of *usque* with *utcumque*. *Usque* denotes continuity, not absolutely like *semper*, but from a certain point or to a certain end: *usque . . . quoad* or *donec*; continuity during, *usque . . . dum*; or whenever, *usque . . . quotiens*; or as here—with unusual combination—*usque . . . utcumque*. The failure to recognize this correlation has caused interpreters ancient and modern to attribute the music of the pipe (*fistula*) either to Faunus himself, or to Tyndaris. But it seems to me obvious that Faunus comes summoned or lured by the music of the shepherd's pipe. That is: "swift Faunus abandons his Arcadian haunt for Lucretilis whenever he hears the sound of my pipe, and at such times his presence lends protection to my flocks, which graze peacefully and fear not wolves nor serpents." It is the shepherd's familiar boast of superior skill in song as an allurement to add to material riches. With similar exaggeration Corydon:

mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae,  
lac mihi non aestate novum, non frigore deficit.  
canto quae solitus, si quando armenta vocabat,  
Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho.

Thus, our shepherd protests to Tyndaris, "I enjoy the protection of the gods—*di me tuentur*, for my devotion and my songs are dear to them—*dis pietas mea et musa cordi est*." *Musa* is of course in ultimate intention the lyric verse of the poet Horace, but in the figure of this pastoral setting it is the music of the shepherd, his piping, the *dulcis fistula* of the preceding. The best commentary on the whole situation is Horace's own in the twelfth ode of book four:

dicunt in tenero gramine pinguum  
custodes ovium carmina fistula  
delectantque deum cui pecus et nigri  
colles Arcadiae placent.

NEW HAVEN

## THE STATUS OF ACTORS AT ROME

By TENNEY FRANK

THERE are several passages in our Latin sources which indicate that some sort of stigma was attached to at least a part of the profession of acting. Livy (vii. 2. 12, written about 25 B.C.) implies that men engaged in what he calls the *ars ludicra* (except Atellan actors) were removed from the tribal list of voters and from army service. Yet we know that actors like Aesopus and Roscius were on intimate social terms with many of the Roman nobility. Equally inconsistent references appear again and again in our sources, and there is no agreement among scholars as to just how we should define the status of actors at Rome. It seems to me that if we assume a gradual semantic change in the meaning of the phrase *ars ludicra*, a change which corresponds to the gradual deterioration of the Roman stage in its drift from the old literary drama toward the mime, we shall be able to get rid of at least a part of the confusion.

The phrase *ars ludicra* seems not at first to have been applied to the regular performances of the literary drama, but only to music-hall performances in which dancing predominated. The words first occur in Plautus:

meum cor coepit artem facere ludicram,<sup>1</sup>

where the *Thesaurus L.L.* rightly adds: (*h. e. saltare*). Next we seem to have a quotation from a censorial decree of 115 B.C. in Cassiodorus' *Chronica* for 639 A.U.C.:

censores artem ludicram ex urbe moverunt praeter  
Latinum tibicinem cum cantore et ludum talarium.

Hauler<sup>2</sup> has shown that the *ludum talarium* was a Greek "Sang- und

<sup>1</sup> *Aulularia* 626.

<sup>2</sup> *Wiener Stud.* (1917), p. 174. He has read the passage of Fronto (*De orat.* ii. 5) as follows: "Laudo censoris factum, qui ludos talarios prohibuit quod semet ipsum diceret cum ea praeteriret difficile dignitati servire quin ad modum crotali aut cymbali pedem poneret." Cicero (*De off.* i. 150) probably has this decree in mind when, in listing the occupations that are *minime probandae*, he includes "Unguentarios, saltatores totumque ludum talarium." He does not, however, include all acting, as was customary a hundred years later.

Tanzspiel." It is, of course, impossible to suppose that all dramatic performances could have been banished from Rome in 115, the hey-day of Accius' numerous and worthy successes, so that in the decree just cited the phrase *ars ludicra* must, by implication, be defined with the help of the two exceptions mentioned—the *Latinus tibicen cum cantore* and the *ludus talaris*. Accordingly, the phrase here must refer to the cheaper kinds of mimetic song and dance, which apparently were so coarse as to fall under the censors' reprimands. We next find the phrase in Cicero's *De orat.* ii. 84, where apparently it is applied to some kind of Pyrrhic dance:

Ars ipsa ludicra armorum, et gladiatori et militi  
prodest aliquid.

A few years later, in the *De rep.* iv. 10, Cicero—if he is correctly quoted—speaks of the Romans as disdainful of the stage:

cum artem ludicram scaenamque totam in probro  
ducerent.

Here *ars ludicra* seems to be a part, but not the whole, of stage entertainment; *scaena* is the more inclusive word.<sup>1</sup> It would appear, then, that in these passages,<sup>2</sup> taken from the literature of the Republic, *ars ludicra* does not refer to all acting on the stage, but only to the lighter performances of the variety theater.

With the end of the Republic, however, the old legitimate drama practically died out. Mimes lived on, music-hall performances grew

<sup>1</sup> The passage in Augustine, *Civ. dei.* II, 13, which quotes from the fourth book of Cicero's *De republica*, would be very important if we knew how exact the quotation was, but Augustine says rather disconcertingly (II, 9) that in quoting he alters the text to make it clear: "non nullis propter faciliorem intellectum vel praetermissis vel paululum commutatis." We know now that he padded the passage about the libelous *carmina*, and in his eagerness to condemn the theater he may also have inserted some phrases of his own regarding the theater in general. The passage as he gives it reads: "cum artem ludicram scaenamque totam in probro ducerent, genus id hominum non modo honore civium reliquorum carere sed etiam tribu moveri notatione censoria voluerunt." I suggest that the phrase *scaenamque totam* may belong to Augustine, just as in the passage at II, 9, the phrase *sive carmen condidisset quod infamiam faceret* is an insertion *propter faciliorem intellectum*. If this be true the *genus id hominum* refers only to actors in cheap entertainment.

<sup>2</sup> The phrase occurs only once more in a republican document, but there it is not defined. This is in a fragment of Caesar's uncompleted legislation, usually called the *Lex Jul. munic.* (CIL, I<sup>2</sup>, 593, l. 123). Here Caesar excludes from Italian municipal office several classes of men, including *queve lanistaturam artem ludic[?]am facit*. It is usually assumed that this refers to all actors, as do the imperial *responsa*, but in the light of republican usage I think it probably covers only the variety theater.



more popular, and, above all, the pantomime, consisting largely of mimetic dancing, came into great prominence. From that time on, therefore, the phrase *ars ludicra* seems to suffice to describe practically all theatrical performances, since all were of the cheaper type, and it can at last be used practically as a synonym of *scaena*. Hence, when Valerius Maximus says

Non ars ludicra Roscium, sed Roscius ludicram  
artem commendavit,<sup>1</sup>

he means by *ars ludicra* any performance on the stage. It is quite clear that Cicero would not have used that phrase of Roscius, since it meant in his day a type of performance with which Roscius was not identified, but writers of the Empire were not aware of the distinction and began to saddle the opprobrious term on actors who in their day were far from being disgraced. It is in this new sense that Seneca uses the words in *Epist.* 88. 22:

ludicrae artes sunt quae ad voluptatem oculorum  
atque aurium tendunt,

and other writers follow suit.<sup>2</sup> When we come to discuss the later use of the phrase in the jurists, it is this semantic change that must be kept in mind.

However, the question of the status of actors is not wholly solved by this one observation. Difficulties remain. It is not only the misunderstanding of the phrase *ars ludicra* that has caused trouble. The use of manumitted slaves on the stage in Cicero's day, the anecdotes about Roscius and Laberius, and the consensus of legal opinion found in the imperial jurists have led historians of the stage to assume that the Roman theater had always freely employed slave-actors and that free actors fell under the censor's official disfavor even at an early day. Are these conclusions justified? The status of the theater was, of

<sup>1</sup> ii. 4. 4 (a careless summary of Livy vii. 2); vi. 9. 6 (Sulla's devotion to the *ars ludicra*, probably mimes and Atellana); viii. 7. 7 (*non ludicra ars Roscium sed Roscius ludicram artem commendavit*); viii. 10. 2 (*Aesopum Rosciumque ludicrae artis peritissimos*).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 10: "si in Graecia natus esses, ubi ludicras quoque artes exercere honestum est"; Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 16; and several passages given in the *Thes. L.L., sub voc.* Even Livy (xlv. 32. 9, written about 10 B.C.) seems to use the term generally for all the entertainers, including athletes, that Aemilius Paullus gathered together for his games at Amphipolis. Quintilian iii. 6. 18, "qui artem ludicram exercuerit," seems to be quoting from Domitian's *lex theatralis* (Suet. *Dom.* 8), or possibly from that of Augustus (Pliny *HN* xxxiii. 32).

course, uncertain all through the Republic. On the one hand, the senate insisted upon having tragedies and comedies presented at the festival seasons, regularly voting public funds for them and ordering the praetors and aediles to procure the plays and organize the games at which they were to be given. This shows a public interest in the drama that can be paralleled in only a few modern states. On the other hand, the censors repeatedly refused to permit permanent theaters to be built—an attitude that can also be readily paralleled in modern times. Continental scholars, who are accustomed to the public subvention of municipal theaters, are prone to find in this a very serious mark of disrespect for the theater. They forget, perhaps, that republics are slow to advance money for anything except religious cults and public necessities. In Greece the theater was, of course, a part of the cult, whereas at Rome it was not. The delay in building a public theater at Rome, therefore, must not be taken as very significant of the general attitude of Romans toward the drama.

Warnecke<sup>1</sup> has summed up in a well-written article the orthodox opinion of continental scholars regarding the status of Roman actors. However, he seems to me not only to have approached the question from the point of view of the Greek stage—which is not apposite—but to have spoken of actors of all classes with little recognition of the Roman distinctions between drama and cheap amusement. Moreover, he has failed to consider the evidence of the Republic and that of the Empire separately; he has made no distinction between the restrictions on knights and those on common folk, and, in a word, has failed to read his evidence in the light of shifting social and dramatic conditions. Without trying to examine his article in detail, I shall attempt to review the evidence in its historical sequence.

When Livius brought the drama to Rome in 240 B.C., directly after the First Punic War, he translated a Greek play, and it is probable that he secured the aid of some Greek actors from Syracuse to help stage the play, for King Hiero came to Rome to see the *ludi*.<sup>2</sup> Livius,

<sup>1</sup> *Neue Jahrb.* (1914), pp. 95 f., and article "Histrio" in Pauly-Wissowa. Cf. also P. Olganier, *Les incapacités des acteurs en droit romain* (Paris, 1910). Warnecke, making the strange assumption that acting was always in the hands of slaves at Rome, fails to see that in this matter the Republic differs very much from the Empire.

<sup>2</sup> Eutropius iii. 1: "Hiero Roman venit ad ludos spectandos." The precise year is not certain, but this paragraph mentions events of the years 240-237 B.C.

himself, took one of the principal rôles. That Greek tradition had something to do with shaping the traditions of the early stage appears from the fact that writers and actors were soon incorporated in an honorable guild to which a bureau was assigned by the state at the temple of Minerva.<sup>1</sup> Such clubs of literary men were to be found at Alexandria<sup>2</sup> and probably at Syracuse, where Alexandrian fashions were copied. It is probably the same club to which the dramatist Accius belonged more than a century later. Livius and Plautus were both actors as well as writers. Actors were then very scarce, since for many years only two plays were produced each year and only one performance was given of each play. Even forty years later only six days annually were set apart for dramatic performances. In such conditions men could hardly afford to adopt the profession for a living, nor would it pay to train slaves for such an occupation. Accordingly, the dramatists themselves took rôles, trained amateurs, and employed Oscans, Faliscans, and Praenestines, who lived in cities where the drama flourished more vigorously than at Rome. The actors that happen to be mentioned (Ambivius, Atilius, Pello, Cincius, Minucius, Rupilius, Statilius, etc.) bear Latin names. Greek troupes were occasionally imported to present<sup>3</sup> Greek plays, and presumably some of these actors may have been induced to take up the profession in Rome in the second century when enough plays were given to make the profession lucrative. We never hear of slaves<sup>4</sup> becoming actors until Cicero's day, more than a century and a half after the drama was

<sup>1</sup> Festus (448 L.) "publice adtributa ei (Livio) in Aventino aedis Minervae in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque consistere ac dona ponere, in honorem Livi quia is et scribebat fabulas et agebat" (207 B.C.).

<sup>2</sup> Strabo xvii. 794.

<sup>3</sup> Polyb. xxx. 14 (167 B.C.) and Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 21 (referring to 146 B.C.). Even Brutus found actors in Naples for his plays (Plut. *Brut.* 21).

<sup>4</sup> Plaut. *Cist.* 785, *qui deliquit vapulabit*, I take to be one of the jokes of the play. Warnecke (p. 105) incorrectly cites Tac. *Ann.* i. 77, to prove that during the Republic actors were amenable to corporal punishment. The reference is to Augustan times when slaves were freely used on the stage. The custom of giving palms and crowns (Varro *LL* v. 178) to the successful players would hardly have originated with slaves on the stage, nor would there have been much point in excluding players *ex tribu* had they been of that class. Nor is it wholly likely that citizens would have played on the boards together with slaves during the Republic. In Cicero's day (*Pro Roscio*, ca. 67 B.C.), when the stage had begun to decline, we find that the custom had arisen of training clever slaves for the theater, but it is probable that they were manumitted before their first appearance.

first introduced, and, so far as we know, these were manumitted before their appearance.<sup>1</sup>

There has been some misunderstanding about the social status of the great actors Roscius<sup>2</sup> and Aesopus, both of whom made their names in the great literary works of the preceding century. Roscius was certainly a Roman citizen and was very highly respected, not only for his art, but for his personal qualities as well. Cicero says that he was in every way worthy of being a senator. Clodius Aesopus was also a Roman citizen, though he bore a Greek cognomen. It is an unfounded guess that he was a freedman. He could hardly have dared exert his influence on the stage in political causes as he did if he had once been a slave, nor would he have been accorded his high position in Rome's aristocratic society if he had been a freedman. The only likely supposition is that, like the poet, Archias, he had once been a respected Greek citizen who had been granted Roman citizenship and a Roman name because of his art and through the intercession of some powerful friend. His son eventually married a Caecilia Metella, which reveals the social standing of the family. We cannot conclude from anything that we know of these two men that the old plays of Rome were being interpreted by actors who were not highly respected.

During the Empire, of course, all actors were branded with legal *infamia*. A definite passage of Ulpian in the *Digest* (iii. 2. 2, 5) gives a date *ante quem* about the time of Nero for this legal enactment: "Eos enim qui quaestus causa in certamina descendunt, et omnes propter praemium in scaenam prodeuntes famosos esse Pegasus [time of Vespasian] et Nerva filius [under Claudius or Nero] responderunt." At that time all theatrical spectacles were so coarse that we could hardly expect anything else. This passage gives clear proof that all professional actors were stigmatized during the Neronian period.

<sup>1</sup> Most of Warnecke's citations (p. 97, n. 2) purporting to prove that the actors were slaves are from the literature of the Empire. For the Republic there is no convincing proof. Panurgus was a slave, but died before he appeared on the stage (Cic. *Pro Roscio com.* 27); Eros seems to have been free (*ibid.* 30; he personally chose his instructors); Antiphon was manumitted before his first appearance (Cic. *Att.* iv. 15. 6), Fufius has a gentile name; of Spinther and Pamphilus (Val. Max. ix. 14. 4) we know nothing. Even Cytheris, the player of mimes, had been manumitted.

<sup>2</sup> Von der Mühl's recent article on Roscius in Pauly-Wissowa corrects most of the old errors of Ribbeck and others. But the article on Clodius Aesopus in the same encyclopedia needs revision. On Roscius the oration of Cicero, *Pro Roscio com.*, should be read. On Aesopus' son see *Class. Rev.*, 1920, p. 92.



Going back farther into the early Empire, we have a well-known passage from the Preface of Cornelius Nepos written during the first years of the Empire, in which, after mentioning that Greeks might marry actors, have several *amatores*, etc., he adds: "in scaenam vero prodire ac populo esse spectaculo nemini in eisdem gentibus fuit turpitudini, quae omnia apud nos partim infamia, partim humilia atque ab honestate remota ponuntur." Here, unfortunately, Nepos does not state clearly in which of the two classes (*infamia* and *humilia*) he places acting, but he at least makes it plain that in his day it was not considered wholly respectable to "make a display" of one's self. One also draws the conclusion from this statement that it was not the following of a paid profession<sup>1</sup> that seemed undignified in Roman eyes so much as *populo esse spectaculo*.

These lines should be read in connection with the above-cited passage of Livy (vii. 2. 12) written about 25 B.C.: "Quod genus ludicrum [i.e. Atellana] ab Oscis acceptum tenuit iuventus, nec ab histrionibus pollui passa est. Eo institutum manet ut actores Atellanarum nec tribu moveantur et stipendia, tamquam expertes artis ludicrae, faciant." This passage does not say, as is usually assumed, that all *histriones* except the Atellans were *tribu moti*. Livy leaves no doubt that actors in the *ars ludicra* were so treated, and he implies that the Atellan farce is of the same quality as *ars ludicra* so that he has to explain why the actors in such plays escaped the censorial brand. Since we have already pointed out that the phrase *ars ludicra* is not in any clear instance used of the legitimate stage during the Republic, I should say that this passage of Livy (post-republican at that) provides no support for the orthodox opinion that all actors were subject to civic disqualification before the Empire. The very fact that Ulpian goes back only to the responses of Pegasus and Nerva filius<sup>2</sup> shakes our faith in that opinion. All we can be positively sure of, so far, is that the *ars ludicra* was stigmatized by the censors some time during the Republic, and

<sup>1</sup> Warnecke's contention that it was working for pay that incurred the brand does not seem plausible, for Ulpian goes on to mention several exceptions where mere service at the games brought no *infamia*: "qui aquam equis spargunt ceteraque eorum ministeria" (*op. cit.* iv. 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Labeo* is cited also, but not for a definition of *infamia*, as Warnecke says, but for a definition of *scaena*. The passage in Paulus (*Dig.* xxiii. 2. 44), taken from the *Lex Julia* of 18 B.C., deals only with *senators*, who are here forbidden to marry freedwomen and anyone who *artem ludicram fecerit*.

that before Nero's day, at a time when there was no legitimate drama left, this brand was applied to all actors.

It is, of course, interesting that Ulpian attributes the disgrace of the profession to acting for pay (*quaestus causa*). Now it is quite clear to us that working for pay was no disgrace during the second century B.C., and never brought *infamia*, *ipso facto*, to anyone of plebeian rank before the Empire. The case of Roscius, which is often cited in this connection, is not apposite, for he was a knight, and knights as well as senators had to do deference to customs and restrictions that did not apply to the commons. Even in the case of Roscius we may have misread the evidence. We know that he played gratis, refusing pay after Sulla raised him to the knighthood, but that may have been a matter of personal etiquette. Cicero certainly implies as much when he praises him for refusing pay, as though it was not compulsory for him to do so (*Pro Rosc. Com.* 23: "Decem his annis proximis HS sexagiens honestissime consequi potuit; noluit"). This looks very much as though even a knight might act for pay and keep his rank, though, of course, the passage is not decisive. Furthermore, the famous example of Laberius must not be cited to prove a general restriction. Laberius, it will be remembered, was compelled in 46 to act in one of his own mimes because it contained criticism of Caesar, and he thereby forfeited the knight's ring, but this was, after all, in a mime, which belonged to the general class of *ars ludicra*. We must observe the distinctions of types. These two cases, therefore, prove less than they are supposed to. One thing is certain to those who have any knowledge of social conditions during the Republic, namely, that Ulpian's statement that acting for pay was taboo could not have applied to actors of ordinary rank during the Republic. In the days of Ennius, Plautus, and Terence very much of the work at Rome was still being done by free citizens, and even manual labor did not then involve any disgrace that could have resulted in a censorial *nota*.<sup>1</sup>

Having shown that, so far as the definite evidence goes, we know only that the lower type of acting incurred *infamia* during the last century of the Republic, I am willing to admit that, so far as the evi-

<sup>1</sup> Warnecke (p. 98) takes in all seriousness the amazing statement of Dionysius (ix. 25) that citizens were prohibited from taking part in trade or industry in early Rome. Dionysius has, of course, misreported something that he has heard regarding senators.

dence goes, the stigma may possibly at some time during the Republic have been affixed to all acting. I do not believe that it was, but it must be admitted that censors who could tear down theaters and banish philosophers might also have tried to discourage Romans from entering the profession of acting by stigmatizing those who did. If this were proved, I should be willing to take Augustine's quotation from Cicero's *De republica* as accurate in so far as it might apply to one or two pairs of puritanical censors like Cato and Nasica. But, in view of the rest of the evidence and in view of the constant senatorial subventions to the theater, I am not inclined to rest much on a quotation made by Augustine when he warns us that he is not quoting precisely.

I should also like to suggest that even if we take Livy (vii. 2. 12) as saying more than he does, if, for example, all actors were removed from army service and the voting lists in the early Republic, it might originally have been intended as an honorable exemption and not as a disgrace. In the early days actors were very scarce, and, since the four festivals of each year were a serious concern of the state and the plays were an integral part of them, it is not unlikely that the praetors and aediles looked with disfavor upon the possible disruption of the company of actors upon whom the success of the performance depended. They may well have secured their exemption from military duty. The proper manner of doing so at Rome—where citizenship was so closely bound up with army service—would be for the censors to strike such names off the tribal rolls. We have recently seen in the Alexandrian charter of Cyrene how certain classes of citizens, such as doctors, teachers of music, and heralds, were for similar reasons relieved of military service.<sup>1</sup> We cannot, of course, in the light of our meager date, be certain, but I should hazard the suggestion that at some early day the magistrates who were responsible for the games may have procured this exemption temporarily, and that, a century later, when the stage had deteriorated and when slaves were invading the profession until it was on the point of losing its standing, the exemption was, on this hypothesis, assumed to be a mark of disgrace and as such enforced against variety actors. We have all met with the strange belief that schoolmasters are at present disqualified for jury service because of inexperience in practical affairs.

<sup>1</sup> In *Abhand. Preuss. Akad.* (1925), par. ix.

To summarize, then, we have no certain evidence that actors of the Republic playing on the respectable stage in the old recognized drama were actually stigmatized by being removed from the *tribus*. We know that certain types of the *ars ludicra* were suppressed in 115 B.C. and that in the late Republic, at least, the censorial brand of *infamia* rested upon all actors who took part in the lower-class performances that went under the name *ars ludicra*. We know that in Cicero's day acting for pay on the legitimate stage was looked upon with so much disfavor, at least, that Roscius, after being knighted, refrained from accepting pay. The censorial stigma of *infamia* cannot be proved as applying to actors in general until well on in the Empire. On the other hand, we cannot demonstrate by explicit source references that the censorial brand was not applied earlier, but we have suggested that, if such evidence should come to hand, it may be argued that the removal from the tribal rôle may at first have come by way of exemption from military service in order to protect the festivals. Finally, we have shown that there is no evidence to support the opinion that slaves ever acted on the Roman stage during the Republic, though there is evidence that ex-slaves appeared on the boards in Cicero's day.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

# VALERIUS FLACCUS IN THE MEDIAEVAL FLORILEGIA

By B. L. ULLMAN

THREE of the four *florilegia* which have been cited by me in earlier articles contain excerpts from Valerius Flaccus: Escorial Q. I. 14 (e), Paris 7647 (p), Arras 64 (a). The fourth, Paris 17903 (n), omits these excerpts.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, they are contained in another manuscript of the same general type, Paris 8089 (which I shall call c). This is a French manuscript of the fifteenth century which once belonged to Claude Dupuy, as may be seen from the inscription "Cl. Puteani" at the bottom of page 1. Another inscription, which I have not deciphered, has been erased on page 1 (top) and inked out at the end of the manuscript, on page 225 (bottom). I make out *Id . . sil* and a few other letters.

The contents of this manuscript are the same as of the others except that the authors from Lucan to Calpurnius are omitted. These include all the works which I treated in previous articles. The interruption in the order of the Cicero excerpts is corrected by placing the selections from Quintilian and Seneca (*Lucil.*) after those from Cicero's orations. This also brings all the Seneca selections together, for the selections from the *Querolus* and Macrobius are omitted. Seneca *Rem.* precedes *Ben.* and *Clem.*; Boethius (*Categ.*), Gellius, Caesar, Cassiodorus, and Suetonius are omitted.

Of these four manuscripts only one (p) has been reported by Kramer in his Teubner edition of 1913. As there are mistakes in his report, I give a complete collation of this manuscript as well as the other three, based on Kramer's text.<sup>2</sup>

The running head is "Gaius in argonauticon" in e p, "Taius in a." in a, "Taius in 1° a." and "In argonauticon Taius" in c.

## i. 22-23

*tit.*: Gaius valerius flaccus in 1° argonauticon e a Taius etc. a Tanus a<sup>2</sup>. G. v. f. in primo argonaticon p Taius v. f. in 1° argonanticon c.—22 primus e.—23 cruz i.m. p.—amnes om. e p a c ore p fortasse a p<sup>1</sup> vel p<sup>2</sup> add.

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Phil.*, XXIII (1928), 132.

<sup>2</sup> When a reading is cited without a manuscript reference, it occurs in all four of the *florilegia*.

## i. 76-77 (tu—Gloria)

¶ *e.*—puris *c.*—Gloria] *G litt. maiuscula e p a (rub. p a) loria c. N(ota) contra gloriam i. m. e<sup>2</sup>.*

## i. 39 (fictis—dictis)

¶ *e.*—fictis vultus dat.

## i. 248-49 (ite—iuvet)

¶ *e.*—evintite *e corr. e<sup>2</sup>.*—menisse *p corr. p<sup>1</sup>.*

## i. 320-34 (nate—dextra)

*tit.*: Planctus alcimedes (alcimedis *a<sup>2</sup> c*) matris iasonis cum iason (iason *om. p*) vellet ingredi navem in colchon (colchorum *p*) insulam iturus ad raptum aurei velleris.—¶ *e p a.*—O nate *c.*—321 hoc *p* hos *p<sup>1</sup>.*—casum *p* casus *p<sup>1</sup>.*—327 N(ota) *i. m. a.*—heu.—328 avexi *e* advecti *p<sup>1</sup>.*—frixii *e.*—329 insompnia.—330 Prospitio *e.*—quociens *a.*—rancos *c.*—littoris.—331 sithicum *e* seiticum *p* siticum *a c.*—332 de *om. a c.*—credebam *a<sup>2</sup> c.*—334 dulcis *a c* dulci *a<sup>2</sup>.*

## i. 579-81

*tit.*: De domo ventorum *i. m. e p a in textu c.*—¶ *e p a.*—s(cilicet) de monte ethne in Sicilia *i. m. e<sup>2</sup>.*—580 horenda *p.*—quod *p* quot *p<sup>2</sup>.*—581 cum lapidibus super Molibus *scr. e<sup>2</sup>.*—infrenas *p a c* infernas *e p<sup>2</sup>.*—totiens *e p* tociens *a c.*—undis *c.*

## i. 584-96

586 Currunt hic *e* Est tunc hic *p a* Est tuue hic *c* iter *sscr. p<sup>2</sup>.*—587 Ifelix *e.*—588 libia.—abrumperet *e p* arumperet *a c.*—calpē *a* calpen *a<sup>2</sup>* (*fort. calpē in calpen statim ab a<sup>1</sup> corr.*).—589 Oceanus.—enotria *e p a c* oenotria *p<sup>2</sup>.*—593 coors *p a c.*—vix] tum.—calibs *p a c* calips *e.*—iteraue *p* iterataue *p<sup>2</sup>.*—594 furentum *e.*—595 additus *a<sup>1</sup>.*—clustra *p a* clu<sup>a</sup>stra *p<sup>2</sup>* clastra *c.*—refringit *vel simile eras. e<sup>2</sup>.*—596 portat *p* porta *p<sup>2</sup>.*

## ii. 43-46 (ignota—arbor)

*tit.*: In II° (secundo *p*) *i. m. e p a c.*—¶ *e p a c.*—captus] timidus *p a* timidis *e* tumidus *c.*—N(ota) de viatoribus noturno tempore per loca ignota *i. m. e<sup>2</sup>.*—44 quescit *c.*—45 Non oculis *e a c* A oculis *p.*—vetus *p* metus *p<sup>2</sup>.*—utrumque *p a c* utrumque *e.*—46 Corpus.—occurrit.

## ii. 59-60 (in noctem—horis)

¶ *e p a c.*—navigare de nocte *i. m. e<sup>2</sup>.*—60 ratis (*non vitis ut Kramer*) *e p a c.*

## ii. 117-22

*tit.*: De fama *i. m. e p a in textu c.*—¶ *e p a.*—Rex superum famam digna (*Bex sed r i. m. c*) *e p a c.*—120 herebi.—121 fivent *c.*—122 opida *e p c.*

## ii. 263-64

*tit.*: In III° *i. m. p.*—¶ *e p a.*—Stabilem certe optima facta (*fata a c*) Dant animum.—de stabili animo *i. m. e<sup>2</sup> N(ota) i. m. a<sup>2</sup>.*



## iii. 364-65 (fiducia—aestu)

*tit.*: In III<sup>o</sup> *i. m. e a c.*—¶ *e p a c.*—Fidutia *e.*—365 viris] animis.—egro *e a c* egros *p*<sup>17</sup>.—assidue.—mens (*non meus ut Kramer*) *e p a c.*—carpitur (*non crupitur ut Kramer*) *e p a c.*—estu *e a c om.* *p igni add. p*<sup>2</sup>.—N(ota) *i. m. a*<sup>2</sup>.

## iv. 622-23 (saepe—opem)

*tit.*: In IIII<sup>o</sup> *i. m. e a* In quarto *p* In 4<sup>to</sup> *c.*—¶ *e p a c.*—pocior *e.*—N(ota) *i. m. a*<sup>2</sup>.—623 ¶ *e p a c.*

iv. 744

¶ *e p a c.*

v. 324

*tit.*: In V<sup>o</sup> *i. m. e a c* In quinto *p.*—¶ Rebus pudor absit in aretis (*non artis*) *e p a c.*

v. 536

¶ Sceptri omnibus una cupido.

v. 540

¶ Quippe viros trahit ipse calibs (*calips e*).

vi. 200

*tit.*: In VI<sup>o</sup> *i. m. e.*—¶ Mixta perit virtus.

vi. 513-14

*tit.*: In VI<sup>o</sup> *i. m. p a c.*—¶ *e p a c.*—Redeunt tandem sua gaudia victis *e a c* Redeunt sua gaudia *p statim in R.* tandem *s. g. v. corr. p*<sup>1</sup>.—N(ota) *i. m. a*<sup>2</sup>.—514 Quos.—ymago *e.*

## vii. 227-29 (Cunctis communem—dies)

*tit.*: In VII<sup>o</sup> *i. m. e p a c.*—¶ *e p a c.*—Cunctis communem.—N(ota) *i. m. a*<sup>2</sup>.—228 patriamque *v.*

vii. 416

¶ Haut (*Haud c*) equidem pulcros (*pulchros e*) decet inclementia vultus.—de inclementia *i. m. e*<sup>2</sup>.—N(ota) *i. m. a*<sup>2</sup>.

vii. 435 (nec—timenti)

¶ *e p a c.*—de pudore *i. m. e*<sup>2</sup>.

## vii. 511-14 (prestat defixus—dictis)

¶ *e a c.*—prestat *e p a c* perstat *p*<sup>2</sup>.—512 nunc] non.—iuvente *p iuventa p*<sup>1</sup>.—513 dulces tociens *e a* dulces tociens *p tociens tociens c.*

The readings confirm the views as to the relationship of *e p a* previously presented. One reading suggests an interesting speculation. In vi. 513 *p* at first omitted *tandem* but at once saw his mistake and corrected it by erasure and re-writing before proceeding further. Now

*tandem sua* is an arbitrary substitute for *mox* in the *florilegia*; *tandem* was substituted for *mox* to make a more generalized statement when taken out of its context, and *sua* was added to preserve the rhythm. Was the omission of *tandem* by *p* a coincidence, or did the manuscript he was copying have the word in the margin, where it could be overlooked, thus preserving the form of the archetype of all the *florilegia*? This hardly seems possible.

That *c* belongs to the *p a* group is obvious enough. It cannot be a copy of *p* because the latter omits *Iason* in the title of i. 320 and *estu* in iii. 365, in both of which cases *c* agrees with the other manuscripts, not to mention less striking examples. This in spite of the agreement of *c* with *p*<sup>2</sup> in i. 595. Some readings suggest that *c* was copied from *a*: title *Taius a c*; title i. 320 *alcimedis a*<sup>2</sup> *c*; i. 332 *de om. a c*; *credebam a*<sup>2</sup> *c credam e p a*; i. 334 *dulcis a c*; i. 588 *arumperet a c*; ii. 263 *fata a c*. The readings of i. 332 would seem to be conclusive: apparently *de* was accidentally omitted by *a*, and a reader, noting the unmetrical character of the line, tried to emend by changing *credam* to *credebam*. This was then copied by *c*. But *c* can hardly be a direct copy, for its reading *tociens totiens* in vii. 513 would seem to be due to the insertion of *tociens* above the line as a substitute for *totiens* and its mistaken substitution for *dulces*. The agreement of *c* with *p*<sup>2</sup> in i. 595 is not significant, as *clustra* (see Thesaurus, Forcellini) and *clastra* (see Du Cange) are merely spelling variants of *claustra*.

Diez. B. 60 (in Berlin) has a few quotations from Flaccus, in agreement with the other *florilegia* as follows:

- iii. 364-65 f.m. nulla inest animis
- iv. 623 quam—opem
- v. 324 R.p.a. in arcus
- vii. 416 Haud e. pulchros d. i. vultus

The combination of long and short excerpts in *e p a c* brings out in sharp contrast the conservative treatment of the text in the longer passages and the arbitrary changes in the shorter passages. These changes are at times due to a desire to make a general statement out of a specific one or to make a complete sentence out of a phrase, but sometimes no reason at all is apparent. The change to the plural *vultus* to match *pondera* in i. 39 produces an unmetrical line, unless *dat* is scanned as long. Elsewhere care is taken to keep the line metrical

(vii. 227). In vii. 416 the line is even filled out to make a complete hexameter. The introduction of *quippe* in v. 540 recalls its use in Tibullus i. 1. 25.

The value of the new collation of *p* and of the reports on *e a c* is made apparent when one reads the statements of editors and others arguing from incorrect and incomplete reports. Thus much of Kramer's discussion on pages xliii-xlv is futile. His statements that *e* contains only a part of the excerpts found in *p* and is a copy of *p* are untrue. This error goes back to Schenkl,<sup>1</sup> who for some reason fails to give all the passages found in the Escorial manuscript, and is repeated regularly thereafter. Schenkl however admits the possibility that *e* may not have been copied from *p*. Kramer's argument about *ore* in i. 23 collapses because this is found only in *p*, and is probably a later addition even there. So too his argument on the nonexistent *meus crupitur* of *p* in iii. 365. Likewise *igni* in this line is a later addition, and the other *florilegia* have the correct *estu*. Schenkl<sup>2</sup> gives three examples to show that the "emendations" of *p* are meaningless. Two of these are based on wrong reports; the third is a possible reading.

Furthermore, the *florilegia* have a very important part in the textual history of Valerius Flaccus. Our chief manuscript, Vat. 3277 (V), belongs to the ninth century. We know that certain fifteenth-century manuscripts were copied from a manuscript of about that same date found by Poggio at St. Gall in 1416. Some hold that this lost manuscript (S), which can be restored from these copies, was itself a copy of V. Then there is the lost manuscript reported by Carrion (C), said to date from the tenth century, which some think of value and others reject. In other words, all believe in the value of V, but there is difference of opinion as to S and C. Even the defenders of S and C (such as Giarratano) realize that a manuscript in the hand is worth two in the bush and give V the highest rating. We need not concern ourselves with this question here except in so far as it is involved in the relation of the excerpt manuscripts to the others.

Schenkl,<sup>3</sup> Krenkel,<sup>4</sup> and Kramer hold that *p* (i.e., the *florilegia*) was

<sup>1</sup> *Wiener Studien*, XII (1890), 319.

<sup>2</sup> "Studien zu den *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus," *Sitzungsab. Wien. Akad.*, LXVIII (1871), 309.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *De codicis Valeriani Carrionis auctoritate* (1909), p. 65.

copied from V. This is quite impossible. In a number of places the *florilegia* give correct or possible readings where V is wrong. It may well be that some of these are due to emendation, but that cannot be true of all. If *ei mihi* is what Valerius wrote in i. 327, then *heu mihi* of the *florilegia* must be based on that reading, not on *amipli* of V. If the reading of the *florilegia* is correct in i. 331 (*pontumque polumque*), as most editors assume, it could not conceivably have been attained by conjecture from *potumque cretamque*, the reading of V. Other passages in which the *florilegia* have the generally accepted readings are i. 76 *mentesque* (*mentemque* V); i. 321 *animum* (*abimum* V); i. 330 *raucos* (*paucos* V); i. 331 *deficiam* (*deficiamus* V); i. 579 *a parte* (*aperte* V); i. 587 *Aeolus* (*aebulus* V); i. 589 *Oenotria* (*oenatria* V); i. 595 *refringit* (*refringet* V); vii. 229 *redit itque* (*reditque* V). In vii. 513 editors read *totiens dulcis*, a compromise between *dulces totiens* of the *florilegia* and *totiens ducis* of V. Of these the reading of V might be restored in i. 76. Some scholars have tried to amend anew in i. 331 on the basis of V.

On the other hand, Baehrens has emended i. 39 so as to retain the reading *vultus* of the *florilegia*, but it must be said that emendations by Baehrens are not quoted high on the philological market. In i. 593 the *florilegia* may be right in the reading *co(h)ors tum*, which is defended by Loehbach.<sup>1</sup> At any rate, our choice lies between this and *cohors in* of C.<sup>2</sup> In ii. 43 perhaps the reading *timidus* of the *florilegia* should lead us to accept Heinsius' conjecture *cautus* (reported with approval by Burmann) instead of V's difficult *captus*. This sort of emendation is admirable: it is close in form to V and in meaning to the *florilegia*. In iii. 365 editors for some reason adopt Heinsius' *aegra assiduo*, though V S and the *florilegia* agree on the perfectly satisfactory *aegro assidue*. For *aegro aestu* cf. *aeger pudor* in vii. 514 and *odia aegra* in v. 145. The elision of the long vowel of *aegro* is not objectionable and can be matched by more than twenty other examples in Valerius.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I take this at second hand from Bury and Giarratano.

<sup>2</sup> The emendation *cohors viz* made by Kramer's teacher Sudhaus and adopted by Kramer is quite out of the question.

<sup>3</sup> Walter C. Summers, *A Study of the "Argonautica" of Valerius Flaccus* (Cambridge, 1894), p. 51, n. 1, and Giarratano's ed., p. lv. An exact parallel is vii. 176.

The *florilegia* are independent not only of V but also of S. Though S agrees with them in several correct readings as against V (i. 321, 579, 589), there are enough agreements of V and S where the *florilegia* are right to make it certain that the latter are not descended from S.

Kramer makes out a strong case for the derivation of S from V. But again assuming that in i. 331 the reading *pontumque polumque* of the *florilegia* is right, as Kramer and others do assume, then S is independent of V, for it has *pontumque*<sup>1</sup> while V has *potumque*. This cannot be emendation, for the rest of the line is corrupt.<sup>2</sup> Only a complete study of S, such as no one has yet made, can determine whether Kramer is right in calling it a copy of V. But there is one other argument in which he seems to be wrong.

Krenkel<sup>3</sup> proved that the manuscript from which V was copied had twenty-five lines to the page, and this was admitted by Kramer. The proof is in the dislocation of viii. 136-85 (=fifty lines=one folio) and in the repetition of ii. 213-62 (=fifty lines) in V. The copies of S all omit i. 393-442 (=fifty lines). Krenkel argues from this that the manuscript from which S was copied had twenty-five lines to the page and could not have been V, which has from nineteen to twenty-three. But Kramer's answer is that S itself had twenty-five lines to the page, and that one folio was lost before the fifteenth-century copies were made. This is quite satisfactory except that we are left with the strange coincidence that S had the same number of lines as its grandmother but not as its mother (V). If we were dealing with biological material, this would be quite satisfactory, but, as it is, the coincidence is unexplained by the theory of Kramer.

Attempts to restore the paging of a lost archetype are notoriously hazardous, and I shall not attempt to present any elaborate scheme. But let us carry out the paging begun by Krenkel to explain the omission of i. 393-442 by S and the repetition of ii. 213-62 by V. In working out the paging between the two passages Krenkel had to assume five lines left for subscription or title between the first and second books. Kramer had good reason to criticize this generosity in space,

<sup>1</sup> Unless, of course, our reports of the S manuscripts are wrong, which is possible.

<sup>2</sup> See also Helm, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, XXXI (1911), 265, and XXXIV (1914), 744.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 3 ff.

but failing another explanation we must accept it.<sup>1</sup> Assuming that the same space was left between the other books I found that f. 106v of the archetype ended with viii. 138 and that f. 107 began with viii. 139. This is only three lines off from the paging that we must assume caused the misplacement of viii. 136-85 in V.<sup>2</sup> This seems too close to be attributed to coincidence, especially since no juggling of any kind was done.

Let us try another experiment with the paging. S ended at iv. 317. Undoubtedly the explanation is that the rest of the manuscript had been lost. That it was in bad condition may be assumed from the fact that Poggio found it *in terrors quodam et obscuro carcere, fundo scilicet unius turris, quo ne capitalis quidem rei damnati retruderentur*.<sup>3</sup> The Quintilian which he found at the same time was *incolumem, plenum tamen situ, et pulvere refertum*. The library is described in another letter as *pulvere tineis fuligine ceterisque rebus ad oblitterationem librorum pertinentibus obsoletam pollutamque*. The Asconius found at the same time was in a much-mutilated state, as we know from its copies; cf. too the subscription to Laur. liv. 5:

quae invenimus in Monasterio Sancti Galli quae licet imperfecta et in compluribus locis corrupta esse videantur.

All this is to make clear that the incompleteness of the St. Gall Valerius was due to the loss of a number of gatherings, not to failure to complete the writing of the manuscript. Therefore iv. 317, where S ended, must have been the last line of a folio. Now some explain away the loss of i. 393-442 by attributing a twenty-five-line page to S, as we have seen. But when we examine the twenty-five-line paging as described above we find that f. 52 ended at iv. 324, seven lines from the end of S. This may not be thought very far off, but it is in the wrong direction. It would necessitate increasing the average space between books from five to more than seven, which is quite objectionable.

As so much of S was lost, it is natural to assume that what was left came at the end of a gathering. That is another objection to the twenty-

<sup>1</sup> In V three lines are left for subscriptions.

<sup>2</sup> I naturally omitted iii. 77, iv. 196, and vii. 633, found only in C, and vii. 579-80, found only in C M N T, and I paid no attention to real or possible lacunae.

<sup>3</sup> *Epist.* i. 5; cf. Clark's edition of Asconius, p. xii.



five-line page, which would make S end in the middle of a gathering. There were 2,568 lines in S. Assuming the common gathering of eight leaves, we find that seven gatherings (fifty-six leaves) at twenty-three lines to the page take up 2,576 lines—the number of lines of text in S, plus eight more for two-line titles before each book.<sup>1</sup> This is of course mere guesswork. The number of lines may have varied in S as in V. Perhaps a further study of the copies of S will bring forth additional evidence.

It has been stated that ii. 213–62 are repeated in V. This is not true of S. The first time that the passage occurs in V line 240 is omitted; the second time, line 241. S also omits line 240. In this Kramer sees a strong argument for the assumption that S was copied from V, for it is scarcely likely that two manuscripts would independently omit the same line. That would be an even greater coincidence than the one just discussed. The parent of V S must have had the line, as it is found in the second version of the passage in V. Krenkel rightly saw that there must be significance in the fact that V omitted line 240 the first time and its neighbor 241 the second, but his far-fetched explanation has convinced no one. I suggest that the facts can best be explained as follows: The scribe who wrote the parent of V S omitted 240 by mistake and noticed his error before finishing the page, perhaps after writing the next line. He placed the omitted line at the bottom of the page with appropriate marks just above 241. Having discovered his error before finishing the page, he wrote only twenty-four lines on that page beside 240, so that the total number would be twenty-five as usual.<sup>2</sup> Both S and V (in his first transcription) overlooked the added line, perhaps because the insertion marks were faint. In the second transcription V saw the marks but interpreted them to mean that 240 was to be substituted for 241.

The *florilegia* throw some light on the perplexing question of C, the lost manuscript of Carrion. There are several agreements as against V(S) which cannot be attributed to emendation. The examples are i. 330 (*raucos*), i. 331 (*pontumque polumque*), vii. 229 (*redit itque*),

<sup>1</sup> If we assume six gatherings we get twenty-seven lines to the page and twenty-four left over for titles, etc., which is less likely. With nine gatherings and eighteen lines to the page we get the same result. I have tried all other numbers from twelve to forty lines to the page. They are all quite impossible.

<sup>2</sup> Krenkel (p. 6) explains the misplacement of viii. 460 (459) in a similar way.

vii. 513 (*dulces totiens flor.*, *t.d.* C). The second in particular could not possibly have been emended independently. Either C is what Carrion said it was—an old manuscript preserving genuine readings—or else, if it was descended from V, it obtained some of its good readings from the *florilegia* as well as other sources.

The Valerius tradition seems to be insular in part at least. Kramer has shown that V was descended from a continental insular archetype. S was from St. Gall—an insular center. At Bobbio, another insular center, there was a manuscript of Valerius in the tenth century.<sup>1</sup> Carrion's manuscript, if ancient, came from Belgium or Northern France, in which there were such insular centers as Corbie. The *florilegia* are also French and might have come from the same place.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (1885), 32.477: *Valerii Flacci liber I.* K. Schenkl (*Studien zu den Arg. des Valerius Flaccus* [1871], p. 42) wrongly takes this item with those preceding and following and thinks of excerpts. But no such combination is likely.

## LUCIUS ARRUNTIUS<sup>1</sup>

BY ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS

IF THE article on L. Arruntius in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopedie* may be considered as representing what is thought to be known of the man, I believe a consideration of the passages from which our knowledge is drawn will yield rather more. The substance of that article is in brief as follows: Arruntius was consul A.D. 6, son apparently of the consul of the same name of B.C. 22; Augustus thought him a not unworthy possible successor to his throne. One of the most highly respected members of the Senate, he made a motion regarding the last honors to be paid Augustus, and in A.D. 15 was member of a committee to study the control of the Tiber. In 20 he declined to serve as *patronus* for Gnaeus Piso and the next year sided with Lucius Sulla against Domitius Corbulo in their quarrel. In 25 he became governor of Hispania Citerior but was detained for ten years in Rome, owing to Tiberius' suspicion of him, and governed his province *in absentia*. He was the object of the hatred of both Sejanus and Macro. Before 32 he had been accused but his accusers were punished. Shortly before Tiberius' death he was again accused as the paramour of Albucilla. He committed suicide because he foresaw only worse conditions to come under Tiberius' successor. Tacitus is therefore inaccurate in saying that Tiberius was responsible for his downfall. He was probably adoptive father of Camillus Arruntius and grandfather of the Arruntius Scribonianus who boasts himself "Pompei Magni Abnepos."

This is a rather bare outline; Arruntius is deserving of a fuller biography.

His life and career before his consulship in A.D. 6 are a complete blank to us except that on the basis of that date we may place his birth about the year B.C. 28, or a little earlier. His father had been proscribed by the triumvirs but escaped to Sextus Pompey and benefited

<sup>1</sup> I acknowledge gratefully my indebtedness for many helpful suggestions to my colleague, Professor Kenneth Scott, with whom I have discussed the paper during its composition.

by the amnesty of Misenum in B.C. 39. He took part in the battle of Actium as commander of part of Octavian's fleet and attained in B.C. 22 to the consulship.<sup>1</sup>

Augustus in his last conferences with Tiberius warned him of three or four possible rivals for the succession. Manius Lepidus, he said, was capable enough but disinclined; Asinius Gallus was more than willing but not equal to the task; and the third possibility, variously reported, so Tacitus says, as Lucius Arruntius and Gnaeus Piso, was "not unworthy, and if occasion offered, would have the courage to make a bid."<sup>2</sup> It may well be that Augustus discussed all four men, and the fact that the same estimate was set on the last two named gave rise to the two traditions of which Tacitus speaks.

Obviously, next to Tiberius these four were the outstanding men of the state when Augustus died; two of them succeeded in serving Tiberius without giving up all independence, while the others led the opposition throughout his principate. The latter pair, Arruntius and Gallus, entered inauspiciously upon the new principate by offending Tiberius at his accession.<sup>3</sup> The new Emperor had already one sufficient reason for disliking Gallus; he was the husband of the wife Tiberius had loved and by Augustus' command divorced. But in Arruntius' case, says Tacitus, Tiberius had no previous enmity.<sup>4</sup> He distrusted him, however, as "*divitem, promptum, artibus egregiis et pari fama publice*,"<sup>5</sup> all this in addition to Augustus' characterization of him. In what circumstances he had shown himself *promptus*, what were his *artes egregiae*, why Augustus considered him not unworthy of the imperial power and likely to attempt the winning of it—of all these questions we know nothing, for prior to A.D. 14 his holding of the consulship is the only known fact of his life.

Tiberius, reluctant to undertake the Empire (whether sincerely or feignedly is a question not pertinent to the present discussion), let fall the remark that he would accept a share of the responsibility but not the whole. Gallus asked which share he desired; Tiberius took manifest offense at the suggestion. Gallus went on to argue that the Em-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Prosopographia imperii Romani* A. 928.

<sup>2</sup> Tac. *Ann.* i, 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 12, 13.

<sup>4</sup> "Tiberio nulla vetus in Arruntium ira" (*ibid.* 13).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*; for his wealth, inherited from his father, cf. *ibid.* xi. 7.

pire was indivisible and Tiberius the man qualified to undertake it. Arruntius spoke in similar vein and gave similar offense.

The following year a committee of two was appointed to study ways and means of controlling the Tiber floods. The members of the commission were Arruntius and the great jurist, Ateius Capito.<sup>1</sup> Capito was already the chief commissioner of the three *curatores aquarum*.<sup>2</sup> The remedial measures proposed by Arruntius and Capito were prevented by opposition from the municipalities, partly that the diversion of the Tiber's tributaries would cause floods in their territories, partly on religious scruples connected with the worship of the river deities.<sup>3</sup> Tiberius seems to have been hopeful of future, if not immediate, work on the problem, and instituted a new commission, the *curatores riparum*, composed of five senators whose chairman was probably Arruntius.<sup>4</sup> The first incumbents of the new office describe themselves on the *cippi* as "*curatores riparum qui primi terminaver(unt)*."<sup>5</sup> With this board of five, the three *curatores aquarum* were associated in this work, in Huelsen's opinion.<sup>6</sup> Arruntius' appointment may have been an effort on Tiberius' part to win his support. Capito was probably not a congenial co-worker for Arruntius, for Tacitus<sup>7</sup> says of him "*bonas domi artes dehonestavisset*," and Arruntius had nothing of the sycophant in him.

Five years later the trial of Gnaeus Piso for the murder of Germanicus, the subversion of military discipline and the civil government in Syria, etc., brings before us in a very interesting manner the four men whom Augustus had discussed with Tiberius. Piso requested a number of his fellow-senators to serve as his *patroni* in the court.<sup>8</sup> Lucius Arruntius, Publius Vinicius (MS *Fulnicium*; see Nipperdey, *ad loc.*), Asinius Gallus, Aeserninus Marcellus, and Sextus Pompeius declined on various pretexts; Manius Lepidus, Lucius Piso, and Livineius Regulus complied with his request. Of the four eminent men pointed out by Augustus, one is on trial for his life, two excuse them-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* i. 76.

<sup>2</sup> From A.D. 13 until his death in 22 (Front. *de Aquis* ii. 102, 99; Tac. *op. cit.* III. 75).

<sup>3</sup> Tac. *op. cit.* i. 79.

<sup>4</sup> Dio lvii. 14; cf. *CIL.*, VI, 266, 3109.

<sup>5</sup> *CIL.*, VI, 31541*g,h,o,r,s,u*, 31542*s*; Dess. 5922*c*, 5923*d*, 5924*d*.

<sup>6</sup> *CIL.*, VI, page 266.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.* iii. 70.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 11.

selves from his defense, and one aids him. A consideration of the grouping of Piso's friends throws light upon the parties in A.D. 20, for we know enough about most of these men to say with some confidence why they stood as they did.

Publius Vinicius was son of the consul of B.C. 19 who had won *ornamenta triumphalia* for his victories in Germany following successes in Pannonia, and father of the Marcus Vinicius who was to marry Germanicus' daughter Livilla and to be twice consul, A.D. 30 and 45. He had held some military command in Thrace or Macedonia, been consul in A.D. 2 and some years later proconsul of Asia. In addition to these distinctions in political office, he was an eloquent orator.

Asinius Gallus, son of Pollio who declined to join Octavian's party in B.C. 31 and withdrew from public life under the imperial régime, had been consul in B.C. 8 and proconsul of Asia two years later. He incurred Tiberius' private enmity by marrying Vipsania, offended him at his accession and on several occasions opposed him in the senate.<sup>1</sup> It is also worthy of note that, as we learn from Servius, he took unto himself the prophecy of Vergil's fourth *Eclogue*, another indication of his definite alignment in the opposition. In A.D. 30 he was condemned on Tiberius' charge, according to Dio,<sup>2</sup> that he was jealous of the Emperor's friendship for Sejanus. The nature of the indictment does not concern us here. The case was postponed at Tiberius' instance and Gallus was put in prison where three years later he died. After his death Tiberius accused him as the adulterer of Agrippina.

Aeserninus Marcellus was the nephew of Gallus and son of the Marcellus who had been consul in B.C. 22 with Arruntius' father. In A.D. 19 he was *praetor peregrinus* and his name appears on *cippi* as *curator riparum et alvei Tiberis*.<sup>3</sup> He was heir to wealth and was said by C. Silius in A.D. 47 to have "risen to eminence by his blameless life and his eloquence."<sup>4</sup>

Sextus Pompeius, the consul of A.D. 14, is called by Dio<sup>5</sup> a kinsman of Augustus. The connection is certainly to be sought through Scribonia, wife of Augustus, whose niece of the same name was the wife of Sextus Pompey. The present Pompeius would then be a descendant of Sextus Pompey, with whom Arruntius' father took refuge during the civil war. He was wealthy and an intimate of Germanicus. Later, about A.D. 27-30, he was proconsul of Asia and was put to death by Gaius when that Emperor's purse needed replenishing.

Manius Lepidus, grandson of the triumvir, was consul in A.D. 11; following his defense of Piso he defended his own sister Lepida; he yielded the proconsulship of Africa, for which Tiberius nominated him, to Junius Blaesus in A.D. 21. In the same year his defense of Clutorius Priscus won the approval of Tiberius.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* i. 76, 77; ii. 36.

<sup>2</sup> lvi. 3.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Dess. 5925.

<sup>4</sup> Tac. *op. cit.* xi. 6.

<sup>5</sup> lvi. 29. 5.



He opposed Gallus in the deliberation on the sentence of Sosia in A.D. 24, in which connection Tacitus calls him "gravem et sapientem virum . . . nam pleraque ab saevis adulationibus aliorum in melius flexit; neque tamen temperamenti egebat, cum aequabili auctoritate et gratia apud Tiberium vigerit."<sup>1</sup> In A.D. 26 he was proconsul of Asia; seven years later he died and Tacitus lauds his "moderatio" and "sapientia."<sup>2</sup>

Lucius Piso seems to have been a younger brother of the defendant, consul in B.C. 1; Tacitus calls him "nobilis et ferox vir."<sup>3</sup> His, apparently, was a rather adulatory motion, in which Gallus was also associated, at the close of the trial of Libo, but on other occasions, like Gallus, he was rather independent. He threatened to leave Rome in disgust soon after the Libo episode and was with difficulty restrained by Tiberius. Audaciously entering upon litigation with Urgulania, a favorite of Livia, he came off rather well. In A.D. 24 he was indicted for *maiestas*, and committed suicide.

Of Livineius Regulus we know nothing but that he was probably the grandson of a moneyer under the triumvirs and father of a man who was removed from the senate at some date before A.D. 47, and in A.D. 59 was exiled because of his connection with a riot in Pompeii.<sup>4</sup>

It was, on the whole, a group of very eminent men on whom Piso called for aid in his need.

Of the principals, Arruntius and Gallus had placed themselves pretty openly in the opposition to Tiberius at his accession and shrewdly considered that the defense of a man indicted on the charges that Piso was would not be a wise move for members of the opposition party; Lepidus, on the other hand, although we hear nothing of him between Tiberius' accession and Piso's trial, must have averted suspicion, for he always appears in Tiberius' favor; and so would run no risk to himself by being Piso's *patronus*. Marcellus, a much younger man, connected as we have seen with both Arruntius and Gallus, would be likely to follow their lead. Pompeius had a connection with Arruntius also, and was in addition an intimate of Germanicus. On first thought one is surprised that Piso should make bold to approach him. But Piso had also visited Drusus Caesar for a similar purpose without success.<sup>5</sup> It would have been a great stroke if he could have counted among his defenders a close friend of Germanicus. But Pompeius refused to compromise himself. The reason for Vinicius' re-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* iv. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 27.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 21.

<sup>4</sup> The foregoing sketches are drawn for the most part from the *Prosopographia*.

<sup>5</sup> *Tac. op. cit.* iii. 8.

fusal is not discoverable, for he did not become the father-in-law of Germanicus' daughter until ten years later. Piso's own brother Lucius could hardly refuse to appear for him. Of Regulus' character, position, or connections we know nothing except his present association with Piso.

Arruntius comes into notice again the next year with a new group of men. Together with Mamercus Scaurus he defended their young kinsman Lucius Sulla against Gnaeus Domitius Corbulo.<sup>1</sup>

Of Sulla we know nothing but this kinship and his failure to respect Corbulo to the latter's satisfaction; and of Corbulo nothing else than that he engaged for the next twenty years in prosecuting *curatores viarum* and contractors for fraud in the maintenance of highways.

Scaurus had been among those who offended Tiberius at the time of his accession, was consul later in the year of Sulla's trouble, but never became governor of a province. In A.D. 22 he was one of the accusers in the successful prosecution of Silanus, returning proconsul of Asia, on charges of *maiestas* and *repetundae*. Ten years later he was himself accused of *maiestas* but not tried, and then in A.D. 34 charged with adultery and *maiestas*, whereupon he committed suicide. His character is impugned by Tacitus, Seneca and Tertullian. Seneca describes a loathsome degenerate.<sup>2</sup>

Seneca remarks<sup>3</sup> that Scaurus owed his political preferment solely to his illustrious descent, and Arruntius must certainly have found any association with him exceedingly distasteful.

When Lucius Piso, governor of Hispania Citerior, was assassinated by a native in A.D. 25, Tiberius appointed Arruntius as the new governor of the province, and then refused to permit his departure from Rome where he remained year after year governing Spain through his *legati*.<sup>4</sup> We are told that such detention in Rome was a practice of Tiberius, although we know specifically of but two cases, those of Arruntius and Lucius Aelius Lamia "*qui administrandae Syriae imagine tandem exsolutus, urbi prae fuerat.*"<sup>5</sup> In detaining Arruntius, Tiberius was motivated by fear, according to Tacitus,<sup>6</sup> and the historian's explanation is more acceptable than is usually the case when he attributes a motive to Tiberius. Arruntius was wealthy, his leading position in the Senate was one of great prestige, he was frankly a member of the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Prosopographia*.

<sup>3</sup> *De ben.* iv. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Tac. *op. cit.* iv. 45; vi. 27; *Hist.* ii. 65; Suet. *Tib.* 41, 63.

<sup>5</sup> Suet. *op. cit.* 63; Tac. *Ann.* i. 80. 4; vi. 27. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist.* ii. 65.

opposition party, and the governorship of the Spanish province carried with it the command of an army of three legions. At numerous times during the history of the Empire emperors had difficulties with men less well armed than Arruntius would have been.<sup>1</sup>

Under the year A.D. 33 Tacitus records Tiberius' complaint that the men best qualified for governorships and legionary commands were unwilling to serve, "oblitus," the historian continues, "Arruntium, ne in Hispaniam pergeret, decumum iam annum attineri."<sup>2</sup> Now the words *decumum annum* are obviously not precisely correct. If the appointment followed immediately upon Piso's death in A.D. 25 and that year was reckoned as the first of Arruntius' incumbency, even so the year 33 can be only the ninth. The "ten years" appear again in Dio<sup>3</sup> under A.D. 31 where the figure is even less accurate. The phrase was probably first used by an earlier annalist than Tacitus at a point in his history where it was at least approximately correct, removed from its proper context to another by Tacitus, and by Dio still further separated from its appropriate place. And, most curiously, by Dio's time the "ten years" had become a more significant label for the case than Arruntius' name, which does not appear in the text (*vide infra*).

In A.D. 31 Arruntius was indicted on some charge. It would be interesting to know more than we do of the case, but we know much more than has been generally recognized. Tacitus, narrating the events of the next year, records the conviction and sentence of Gaius Caecilianus for the failure of his prosecution of Cotta Messalinus on a charge of *maiestas*. We are not informed what penalty was imposed (apparently exile was usual),<sup>4</sup> but the precedent for the sentence is given, the similar failure of the case against Arruntius: "placitum eandem poenam inrogari quam in Aruseium et Sanquinius [MS Sangunnium] accusatores Arruntii."<sup>5</sup> The commentators point out that the case must have been narrated in the lost chapters of the fifth book of the *Annals*.

Dio, approaching the overthrow of Sejanus in A.D. 31, sets forth certain alleged causes and evidences of the growing alienation between

<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that Spain and Syria are among those provinces from which the earliest assaults on the throne came in the first century.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann.* vi. 27. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Iviii.* 8. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the case of Firmius Catus (*Tac. Ann.* iv. 31. 8).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 7.

the praetorian prefect and the people. One reason was "because Tiberius quashed an indictment against an enemy of Sejanus, a man who had been chosen ten years before to govern Spain, and was now, thanks to the influence of Sejanus, being brought to trial on certain charges."<sup>1</sup> The anonymous person is of course Arruntius (*vide supra*, p. 31).<sup>2</sup> We are also now enabled to identify Aruseius and Sanquinius (or Sangurius, as Nipperdey suggests perhaps it should be), at least to the extent of placing them among the tools of Sejanus, and also to understand Arruntius' remark at the end of his life, "diu Seiano . . . invisus."<sup>3</sup>

We have seen that the sentence imposed on Arruntius' unsuccessful accusers served as the precedent for the judgment in the case of Caecilianus, whose charge of *maiestas* against Cotta failed the next year. When the sentence in a case is determined by reference to a precedent, it is to be expected that the case cited as precedent is of the same nature as the case before the court. We may, therefore, safely say that Aruseius and Sanquinius accused Arruntius of *maiestas*.

Now, does the plural of Dio's *ἐπὶ τισιν*, "on certain charges," mean a plurality of indictments, as e.g., *maiestas*, *repetundae*, *novae res*, etc.? Or does it refer to the several counts on which a single indictment was based? I confidently believe the latter is the meaning. An exact analogy is to be found in Tacitus' account<sup>4</sup> of the prosecution of Granius Marcellus for *maiestas* in A.D. 15. It was charged "Marcellum sinistros de Tiberio sermones habuisse, . . . statuam Marcelli altius quam Caesarum sitam, et alia in statua amputato capite Augusti effigiem Tiberii inditam." The defendant was acquitted "criminibus maiestatis." Accusers, in the interest of their own safety, generally

<sup>1</sup> lviii. 8. 3 (Cary's trans. "Loeb Classical Library Series").

<sup>2</sup> Since putting the Tacitus and Dio passages together, I have found that Arno Lang called attention to the relation in 1911 in his dissertation, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kaisers Tiberius*, p. 88; "Während seines Amtes [governorship of Spain] wurde er angeklagt, aber auf Veranlassung des Kaisers freigesprochen (Dio 58.8. Tac. vi. 7)." This unobtrusive remark, however, made no impression. Nipperdey-Andresen (11th ed., 1915): "Von dieser Anklage ist nichts bekannt; bei Tac. ist der Bericht darüber in der grossen Lücke nach v. 5 verloren gegangen." Draeger-Heraeus (7th ed., 1914): "Der Bericht über die Anklage ist in der Lücke des fünften Buches verloren gegangen." And the Supplement-Bände I-IV of Pauly-Wissowa (1903, 1918, 1924) add nothing to the original article on Arruntius in Vol. III (1895).

<sup>3</sup> Tac. Ann. vi. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 74; cf. also vi. 5. 1, the prosecution of Cotta on three counts.

based an accusation on several counts, or when possible brought more than one indictment. For the failure of their prosecution was often fraught with dire consequences to themselves. The precaution had been taken by Aruseius and Sanquinius, but in vain.

Following immediately upon his account of the indictment of Arruntius "on certain charges," Dio continues, *καὶ δι' αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἡγεμονεύσειν τινῶν ἢ καὶ ἄλλο τι δημόσιον πράξειν μέλλουσιν ἄδειαν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ τῶν τοιούτων δικῶν ἔδωκε*. Mr. Cary translates: "Whereupon, because of this case, he granted a general immunity from such suits, during the interval before taking office, to all who were designated to govern provinces or to perform any other public business."

Dio's phraseology is curious. *Μέλλω* and future infinitives are only semi-technical language for the Latin *designatus*.<sup>1</sup> *Ἡγεμῶν* can be used to describe almost any official, technically for *princeps*, *princeps iuventutis*, *legatus legionis*, *tribunus*; untechnically for *proconsul*, *propraetor*, *legatus*, various *praefecti*, etc., etc.<sup>2</sup> And as though that were not sufficiently general, *ἄλλο τι δημόσιον πράξειν* is added. Provincial governors were never styled *designati*; the term is confined to elected magistrates in the interval between the *pronuntiatio* of their election and their entrance into office. Furthermore, Arruntius was actually performing the functions of governor through his *legati*—was governor in all but residence. Evidently Sejanus had attacked Arruntius under cover of the technicality that not having entered his province he was not governor, and as long as he remained in Rome was subject to prosecution. The passage records an enactment, framed in the most inclusive terms, exempting from prosecution all public officials appointed by Tiberius and detained by him in Rome, who would not be exposed to prosecution if not so detained; they were always "on the point of going" to their duties.

The enactment is also preserved in very concise and direct phraseology in the *Digest*.<sup>3</sup> "hos accusare non licet: legatum imperatoris

<sup>1</sup> Magie, *De Romanorum iuris vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis* (Teubner, 1905), p. 76; cf. p. 43: "non sollemnia vocabula sed a scriptoribus aut elegantiae aut variandi studio ad arbitrium ficta esse videntur."

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.*, Index, s.v. *ἡγεμονία*, *ἡγεμῶν*, etc.

<sup>3</sup> XLVIII: 2. 12 pr. quoted more fully below.

...." from which it appears that accusation on any charge was prohibited.

It remains to explain how Dio came to write his narrative of the episode in a form which, as it stands, is so unsatisfactory historically. Dio's interest at the moment was Sejanus. The trial of Arruntius concerned him only in so far as it affected Sejanus' fortunes. He was interested, then, only in the fact, not the basis, of the indictment of Arruntius. In his source he found an account of the indictment, detailed at least to the point of specifying the various charges, and followed by a mention of Tiberius' consequent regulation that his delegates, when detained in Rome at his pleasure, should be immune "from such accusations" as those just enumerated. First, Dio considered Arruntius' name much less interesting than his ten-year governorship of Spain. Second, he omitted entirely the statement of the charges in transcribing from his source, although, third, incorporating bodily what followed, to the understanding of which that statement was essential. Dio is notoriously capable of so much carelessness.

Examination of the passage in the *Digest* referred to above adds much of interest to our knowledge. "Hos accusare non licet: legatum imperatoris, ex sententia Lentuli dicta Sulla et Trione consulibus, etc."

Faustus Cornelius Sulla entered upon the consulship May 9, 31. His colleague was Sextus Teidius Catullus. Catullus was succeeded on July 1 by Lucius Fulcinius Trio, who held office for the rest of the year. Sulla was himself supplanted on October 1 by Publius Memmius Regulus.<sup>1</sup> Sulla and Trio were colleagues, then, from July 1 to October 1, during which three months the "sententia Lentuli" was spoken and the indictment of Arruntius thereby quashed.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fasti Arvalium, *CIL*, I<sup>2</sup>, p. 71; Fasti Nolani, *CIL*, X, 1233.

<sup>2</sup> Who was this Lentulus? The following are, I believe, all the possibilities: (1) Lentulus (*Prosop.* C. 1118), a patron of poetry, perhaps identical with (5); (2) Cossus Cornelius Lentulus (*Prosop.* 1124), consul B.C. 1, *praefectus urbis* A.D. 33, son of Gnaeus, the consul of B.C. 18 and intimate of Tiberius, who had died in A.D. 25; (3) Cossus (*Prosop.* 1125), son of (2), consul A.D. 25; (4) Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus Augur (*Prosop.* 1132), consul B.C. 14, proconsul of Asia B.C. 2/1, who was still in the senate as late as A.D. 22, was very wealthy, and, dying at an unknown date, left Tiberius his sole heir; (5) Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (*Prosop.* 1134), son of (2), brother of (3), *praetor peregrinus* A.D. 23, consul 26, *legatus* of Upper Germany 29-39; (6) Publius Cornelius Lentulus Scipio (*Prosop.* 1143), *praetor aerarii*, *legatus legionis IX* A.D. 22, consul 24, and still in the senate in 47. Of these six men the second is by all odds the most likely to



It is very significant, I believe, that the indictment of Arruntius was between July 1 and October 1, and that Sejanus fell on October 18.<sup>1</sup> As opposition leader in the Senate, Arruntius was a formidable obstacle in Sejanus' path—an obstacle which must be removed. The indictment for *maiestas* was to accomplish such removal.

To Tiberius at Capri it must have been evident that if his praetorian prefect could compass the overthrow of Arruntius, he was master of Rome. If the Emperor was already awake to the danger of Sejanus' waxing power, this case must have confirmed any suspicions he entertained; if he was as yet unsuspecting, this move must have brought sudden and convincing indication that Sejanus had designs. However that may be, Tiberius wrote to his trusted friend Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, requesting him to move a decree of the Senate forbidding the indictment of imperial *legati*. Lentulus moved and the Senate, with alacrity, one may imagine, passed the decree. To the Senate it meant the salvation of one of its most eminent members. To Tiberius it meant the grateful support of the Senate if and when it should be necessary to take further measures against Sejanus. To Sejanus it made perfectly clear the fact that Tiberius was still discerning, still attentive to events in the capital, and still competent to act the part of emperor.

Sejanus was compelled to abandon the subtle course which he had thus far followed to advance his interests and was driven to more drastic methods—in short, to conspiracy. And when the plot was betrayed by Satrius Secundus, Tiberius was able to count on the loyalty of the Senate in gratitude for the rescue of Arruntius; the praetorians could be bought; there were one consul, Publius Memmius Regulus, the prefect of the *vigiles*, Publius Graecinius Laco, and the newly appointed successor to Sejanus, Naevius Sertorius Macro, to be counted on. Tiberius felt sufficiently secure to take summary action against Sejanus and his downfall was accomplished October 18.

Arruntius had his revenge against his great enemy by being the passive instrument which indirectly brought about Sejanus' fall.

have been Tiberius' mouthpiece in A.D. 31, and Seneca's characterization of him makes the identification almost certain: "huic tamen multa Tiberius manu sua scripsit neque Cossus aut privatum secretum aut publicum elapsus est" (*Ep.* 83. 15). He had taken his father's place as the Emperor's confidant.

<sup>1</sup> Tac. *Ann.* vi. 25. 5.

In A.D. 32 Arruntius appears in a very interesting incident. It has already been mentioned (p. 37) that Cotta Messalinus was indicted in this year for *maiestas*. The basis of the charge was that being involved in some pecuniary litigation with Arruntius and Manius Lepidus, he had complained of their *potentia* in the court and then remarked "illos quidem senatus, me autem tuebitur Tiberiolus meus."<sup>1</sup> Cotta seems to have been a thoroughly disagreeable person, "promptissimus cum atroci sententia," "saevissimae cuiusque sententiae auctor," "egens ob luxum, per flagitia infamis."<sup>2</sup> Poor himself, he would naturally have some prejudice against those who administered their finances more successfully. The word *potentia* is in common use to denote undue or improper influence or power, and it seems here to be indicated that Arruntius, who is known to have been wealthy, and Lepidus, of whom the same would certainly not be surprising, had in some manner influenced the decision of the court. Or the *potentia* may have been the prestige which they enjoyed as the leaders, respectively, of the opposition and of the imperial party in the Senate.

We come to the last scene of all. Early in A.D. 37 the Senate received a dispatch from the praetorian prefect, Macro, accusing Albucilla of "impietas in principem" and Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, Vibius Marsus, and Lucius Arruntius as her accomplices and paramours; Macro had himself presided over the preliminary hearings.<sup>3</sup>

Albucilla had been the wife of Satrius Secundus, a henchman of Sejanus, the accuser of Cremutius Cordus, and the informant of his master's conspiracy. She was notorious for her intrigues with men.

Domitius was the husband of Agrippina the Younger, and had been consul in A.D. 32, having for his colleague during the first six months of the year Camillus Arruntius, the son, either natural or adopted, of our Arruntius. He was named by Tiberius as one of the commission to assess the damage done by the fire of A.D. 36. He died in A.D. 40.

Marsus, consul in A.D. 17, was *legatus* of Germanicus in Syria two years later, where he yielded the provisional governorship of the province, after the expulsion of Gnaeus Piso, to Sentius Saturninus. He was proconsul of Africa A.D. 27-30 and under Gaius became at last *legatus Syriae*.<sup>4</sup>

Both Domitius and Marsus had close connections with Germanicus and may so be thought of as belonging to the opposition party. But in

<sup>1</sup> Tac. Ann. vi. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. v. 3; vi. 5, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. vi. 47; cf. Dio lvi. 27; Suet. Nero 5.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Prosopographia*.

view of the general suspicion of the case (*vide infra*) Macro may be thought to have had private grudges in both cases.

We learn also of three lesser personages who became involved, perhaps as the case proceeded, since they were evidently not named in Macro's dispatch. Carsidius Sacerdos, Pontius (probably Pontilius, *vide infra*), Fregellanus, and Laelius Balbus were named as Albucilla's "stuprorum ministri."<sup>1</sup>

Carsidius had been acquitted in A.D. 23 of giving assistance to Tacfarinas' revolt in Africa. He was *praetor urbanus* in A.D. 27 but had not advanced beyond that step in the *cursus*.

Of Pontius nothing is known but that a descendant Gaius Pontilius Fregellanus was consul, and patron of Saloniae.

Balbus had just succeeded in obtaining the conviction of Acutia on a charge of *maiestas*.<sup>2</sup>

The absence of any communication from Tiberius respecting the case aroused a suspicion that the indictment was not entirely in good order, that the charges might be wholly fictitious and motivated solely by Macro's "notorious enmity for Arruntius."<sup>3</sup> Owing to this suspicion, the case was postponed. Marsus and Domitius escaped because of Tiberius' death during the postponement, but Arruntius, weary of life and foreseeing only a more intolerable régime to follow that of Tiberius, committed suicide.<sup>4</sup>

It appears that the case against Domitius, Marsus, and Arruntius was not very strong, for no subsequent action was taken against them. But Albucilla, Carsidius, Pontius, and Balbus were all convicted and sentenced.<sup>5</sup>

Whence came Macro's "notorious enmity" toward Arruntius? Both of Tiberius' praetorian prefects had been enemies of Arruntius. Both had attacked him by criminal indictments and both had failed. There may have been a class prejudice between the equestrian prefects and the powerful senator but a more satisfactory and adequate explanation may be found in the significance of Arruntius' position, as was noticed above (p. 38) in connection with Sejanus' attack upon him. With the commanding prestige which he had in the Senate, he would be the

<sup>1</sup> Tac. *Ann.* vi. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Prosopographia*.

<sup>3</sup> "Ob inimicitias Macronis notas in Arruntium" (Tac. *Ann.* vi. 47). Dio frankly calls the charges fabricated (lviii. 27).

<sup>4</sup> Tac. *Ann.* vi. 48.

<sup>5</sup> Tac. *loc. cit.*

foremost obstacle in the path to dominance of a praetorian prefect. Macro, remarking Tiberius' imminent end and determined to be the power behind the throne when Gaius succeeded, was plotting toward that end.<sup>1</sup> In equal degree with his predecessor he felt the necessity of removing Arruntius as the obstacle to his power. He made the mistake, however, of overestimating the power he had already gained. The Senate refused to act against its prominent members on his order uncountersigned by his imperial master. But Arruntius did not accept the escape which the Senate's hesitation gave to his fellow-defendants; he was weary of the futile struggle and preferred death by his own hand to life under Gaius and Macro.

His friends urged him to await developments. But he was obdurate. He had, he said, lived long enough—in fact, too long. He had been hated by Sejanus, now by Macro, always by someone in power. What hope could there be of the youthful Gaius, especially under the influence of Macro, when imperial power had so completely overthrown the character of the mature and experienced Tiberius? "*Documenta sequentia erunt bene Arruntium morte usum*," comments Tacitus.<sup>2</sup> The historian's remark, in view of his attitude toward Gaius, may tend to cast some suspicion on the historicity of Arruntius' last conversation as quoted by Tacitus. It is well known that high hopes of Gaius were entertained by the Roman populace and the provincials, owing principally to his inheritance of his father's popularity. But it is clear that Tiberius had no illusions as to his character.<sup>3</sup> Arruntius had not had quite the opportunities for intimate acquaintance with Gaius' nature that the Emperor had had; but it is not necessary therefore to suppose that he shared the enthusiasm of the populace. At any rate, he well knew what Macro was, and the association between him and Gaius was plain for all to see. That the whole conversation is not fabricated by Tacitus is indicated by the variance between Arruntius' explanation of Tiberius' degeneration and that of Tacitus expressed three chapters later. I therefore accept the content of the conversation as historical.

Five years after his death, his son, Camillus Arruntius, as governor of Illyricum, translated the anti-imperial sentiment into action by revolting against Claudius. For this indiscretion he paid with his life.

<sup>1</sup> Tac. *Ann.* vi. 45; Dio lvi. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann.* vi. 48.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 46.

The fact of the revolt lends interest to the speculation whether the elder Arruntius would have made a similar attempt in Spain, had not Tiberius kept him in Rome during his governorship. At any rate, it is hard not to imagine that the revolutionary ideas were, if not implanted, at least nurtured in the younger by the elder Arruntius. Camillus Arruntius had had the opportunity to observe the futility of his father's pacific opposition, had seen him die a disappointed man, and was determined himself to try what arms could do to the same end.

Lucius Arruntius Scribonianus, the grandson, was more proud of his descent from the great Pompey than of his grandfather. Lucius Arruntius should have lived in other days.

But his was a good and honorable career. Years later Gaius Silius could say of him in the Senate that he had come to eminence by his "in corrupta vita," and Tacitus could write that Cotta Messalinus was never so highly honored as when his prosecution for *maiestas* was avenged in the same manner as had been the "sanctissimae artes" of Lucius Arruntius.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY  
CLEVELAND, OHIO

## THE HISTORICAL TENSES AND THEIR FUNCTIONS IN LATIN

BY JOHN J. SCHLICHER

ACCORDING to our grammars the historical present is used in a vivid or dramatic narration of past events. The explanation given of this use is that past events are thus brought down to the present, or, what amounts to much the same thing, that the narrator in imagination transports himself into the time when the events took place. To him, that is to say, the past appears as though it were really present.

This statement of the function of the historical present, as well as the explanation of its use, is open to serious objections. It is no doubt true that many of the passages which contain historical presents give us a vivid recital of past events. But it is equally true that very many others do not. And when we find that in authors like Caesar and Sallust the historical presents are approximately as numerous as the historical perfects, it requires no argument to show that the present cannot be vivid in all cases, or even in a large number of them. In the epic the proportion of present verbs is even greater than in prose. Virgil has the present almost twice as often as the perfect. It is thus clear that both in the epic and in history the historical present is not an exceptional construction, but an altogether common and normal one.

The explanation that the historical present is used because the narrator in his mind brings the past down to the present or transfers himself into the past is equally untenable. For subordinate clauses which give the setting or circumstances regularly have their verbs in a past tense, even when the main clause has the historical present.<sup>1</sup> The evident irrationality of assuming that the narrator as a regular practice saw the main act as present and its setting as past led Hoffmann<sup>2</sup> to the conclusion that the historical present was felt by the Romans, not as a present at all, but as a past.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the exceptions in early Latin see Sommer, *Rh. Mus.*, LXXIV, 208 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens Historicum im Latein*, p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> A suggestion more recently made by Heinze (*Z. Gebrauch d. Praes. Hist. im Allatein* [Streitberg Festgabe, 1924]) is quite satisfactory for early Latin, but leaves the general question about where it was.

The fact is that an explanation of the historical present on the basis of time alone is quite impossible. For if the events are past and their setting is past, and if the present tense simply means present time, we have arrived at a deadlock. But may it not be that our conception of the function of what we call the tenses is too narrow and mechanical? When we consider that these forms have only in the course of time come to be used as they are by a gradual process of adaptation, that they are, even during the recorded life of a language, still changing, and that their meaning is very largely determined by their environment, we must realize the hardihood of speaking dogmatically on such a point. We realize it especially in the case of the present indicative, which may on occasion be equivalent to a future, a past, or a present perfect, or to any one of several varieties of the subjunctive.

## I

Strictly speaking, the present can be represented in speech only within certain limits. A continuing activity or state of things, a habitual practice, a universal truth, may be spoken of as present, since they continue now as they have in the past. But even here the basis for our present statement is really their existence in the past. Our use of the present is justified by the confident expectation that, having continued for some time, the experience will continue while we make our statement also.

The case is not very different with single happenings or acts which do not ordinarily extend over a space of time. When upon being asked a question by one person which we cannot answer we turn to another with the remark that he is asking this question, we use the present tense, not to represent his spoken words, but his still continuing desire for information. In a similar way we speak of an author long dead as saying this or that which is found in his extant works.<sup>1</sup>

The point to notice in all these cases is that the present represents something as not yet concluded, as still in progress. It cannot, therefore, represent an act or happening in its totality or final consummation. This is, indeed, its most distinguishing and essential feature, more persistently characteristic of it than its association with a particular time.

<sup>1</sup> The same present may even be used of a past inspection of a document which contains evidence important at the present time (cf. Cicero *Ver.* iii. 171).



If now we assume several closely related acts or happenings, as we usually find them in the historical present, we have in our minds a picture not so much of these acts individually as of the series as a whole. No one of the acts is a complete performance; they are merely steps or details in the larger activity presented by the series. That it is the series and not the individual act which is felt to be the unit often appears from the expression by which the group is introduced, as, for example, in the following passage from Cicero (*Pro Sex. Rosc.* 109-10):

Totam vitam, naturam moresque hominis ex ipsa legatione cognoscite. . . . Impedimento est quo minus de his rebus Sulla doceatur: ceterorum legatorum consilia et voluntatem Chrysogono enuntiat: monet ut provideat ne palam res agatur: ostendit. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The close connection of the individual acts in such a passage is made apparent to the eye and the ear also by their compact arrangement. Their relation to one another is rarely indicated by words because it is evident that they are but members of one body. This is true even when the passage is not introduced by a comprehensive expression.<sup>2</sup>

Ad haec visa auditaque clamor ingens oritur. Non iam foro se tumultus continet, sed passim totam urbem pervadit. Nexi vincti solutique se undique in publicum proripiunt, implorant Quiritium fidem. Nullo loco deest seditionis voluntarius comes. Multis passim agminibus per omnes vias cum clamore in forum curritur.—LIVY ii. 23.

In such passages each individual act may be said to present the whole as in a state of incompleteness, as in the process of working itself out. Let us see whether we can discover a reason for the use of the present tense.

The experience of the mind in dealing with things which are in the process of happening is essentially different from its experience in dealing with events of the past. In the former case it is led along from one detail—act or occurrence—to the next, taking them in as well as

<sup>1</sup> Similar introductory expressions selected at random from the *Orations* are: *Ingredivor iam Sesti tribunatum; Itaque hoc mulier facere constituit; Caecinae placuit et amicis . . . experiri tamen; Exitum huius assimilatae familiaritatis cognoscite; Videamus quae deinde sint consecuta; Expectatio summa hominum quidnam id esset.*

<sup>2</sup> For similar passages see Plaut. *Curc.* 354-62; Cic. *Pro Flac.* xx. 47; *Pro Sest.* xxxv. 75; *Pro Caec.* vi. 16; Caes. *BG* v. 31 and 44; Sal. *Jug.* liv. 1; xciii. 6; Hor. *Ep.* i. 7. 77-85; Livy xxi. 9; xxii. 13.

it may, but with only a limited opportunity to judge them individually or grasp them in their relation to one another or their connection with other things outside of those just then taking place. The individual happenings, especially if they succeed one another rapidly or are thought of as occurring at the same time, appear to be of much the same importance. They have their period of high light when they cross the stage of the mind and then pass into something like uniform obscurity as they are displaced by others.

Past experiences, on the other hand, have no such uniform claim to prominence. They are seen in their setting and relations to one another, important or unimportant, clearly recognized or partially, if not wholly, obscured. Whereas present experience is largely a mere succession of events, the past is a pattern in which, varying with the individual person and occasion, details have found a place according to their significance to him. The individual act in the past may be seen as completed or continuing, as independent or as related to some other act. All this is possible because these acts can be passed in review at will, appraised, and compared—a thing quite impossible or only partially possible at the time when they are taking place.

Briefly, the difference between the two is that in the present experience the procession of the events itself determines the course of the experience and limits it quite strictly to the actual occurrences, while in a past experience, in which the movement of events has ceased and the count is all in, the mind is free to determine for itself how the details are to be rated and disposed, what part they are to play in the whole. In the latter case the mind is in control and dominates the experience; in the former, the experience is in control, and the mind merely follows. It is this difference, broadly speaking, which is expressed by the two tenses of narration, the historical perfect and the historical present. Let us proceed to examine in some detail the various uses of each.

## II

The most striking and characteristic use of the historical present, already referred to, is found in passages which record a swift succession of acts performed in a tense and exciting situation. Examples of such passages are the following:

a) *PLAUTUS Aul.* 708-11: Strobilus has just said that he climbed a tall tree to see where Euclio would bury his money. He continues:

Ubi ille abiit, ego me deorsum duco de arbore:  
Exfodio aulam auri plenam: inde exeo ilico.  
Video recipere se senem: ille me non videt.  
Nam ego declinavi paululum me extra viam.

b) *CICERO Ver.* iv. 100: Verres had given instructions to one of his friends to find somebody who could be charged with the theft of the image of Ceres which had been committed at his own order by his slaves.

Res non procrastinatur. Nam cum iste Catina profectus esset, servi cuiusdam nomen defertur. Is accusatur: ficti testes in eum dantur: rem cunctus senatus Catiniensium legibus iudicabat. Sacerdotes vocantur: ex eis quaeritur secreto in curia quid esse factum arbitrarentur, quem ad modum signum esset ablatum. Respondent illae praetoris in eo loco servos esse visos.

The distinguishing features—and they are found, more or less fully represented, in all passages of this sort—are the brief and simple sentences, the asyndeton, the frequent initial position of the verb, and a considerable uniformity of sentence structure. There is a scarcity of modifiers and a marked absence of subordinate clauses, except those whose action lies in direct line with that of the main clauses. When a clause is explanatory in any way, turns aside for a moment from the strict business of narration, it usually has some other tense (*declinavi* in the passage from Plautus, *iudicabat* in that from Cicero).

The brevity of the sentences and their uniformity of structure indicate that the narrator is under strong pressure to move forward, that the successive acts crowd close upon one another in his mind. The absence of connecting words and subordinate clauses shows that he does not consciously realize the precise relation between the acts. The verb stands first and the subject is often absent because that which strikes the mind is the act itself rather than the actor or the nature of what he does.

The general impression which such passages make on the reader is that of a rapidly and vigorously moving series of acts produced by an overpowering pressure of some sort, whether of the antecedent situation, of a strong emotion or determination, or of other acts immediately preceding them. The narrator appears as one caught in the same

inescapable movement, striving to do justice to it in his language, and unable to control it or even to shape very extensively the manner of his expression. He is merely a recorder, and a rather helpless one at that.

When we turn from such typical examples of the historical present to its wider use, we find the same features extensively illustrated here also.

1. In the so-called annalistic present, which our grammars have duly recognized, the writer presents historical events or details without comment, as so many accepted and unchangeable facts. That the practice originated in the brief entries of important events in a chronicle is altogether probable. It is found rather frequently in the first book of Livy, in the prologues of Plautus, in Caesar, and occasionally elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

Addit duos colles, Quirinalem Viminalemque; inde deinceps auget Esquilias, ibique ipse, ut loco dignitas fieret, habitat. Aggere et fossis et muro circumdat urbem; ita murum profert.—LIVY i. 44. 3.

Whole chapters of Caesar are sometimes written in this style; e.g., *BG* v. 37 and 40; vii. 90. It was undoubtedly a strong influence encouraging the use of the historical present by historians generally.

2. Closely related, no doubt, to this use of the present tense is the very extensive use, already referred to, which is made of it in the epic. When fate impels and prompts the actors and shifts the scenes, the poet has but small opportunity to speak in his own right. The less common perfect is found largely in the introductory and transitional passages, which give the setting and background (e.g., *Aen.* i. 12–17, 124–27, 223–26, 402–6, 441–45, 613–14; ii. 1, 67–68, 195–98, 588–93, etc.) in the more purely human parts of the action (*ibid.* i. 175–76, 187–88, 365–68, 450–52, 736–39; ii. 51–53, 376–78, etc.), and especially in the speeches. All these are in their nature more plastic than the main course of events, determined by the gods or by fate.

3. The present is very often used to express sudden, unexpected, or surprising acts or occurrences. In these, also, there is no chance for the person concerned to control or interfere with what happens, or to

<sup>1</sup> Other examples in Livy: i. 3. 10; i. 8. 7; i. 9. 6–7; i. 10. 4; i. 23. 4; i. 27. 4–6; i. 30. 1; i. 34. 2–3 and 8–9; also in Ter. *Andr.* 105, 297; *Hec.* 171; Petron. 30.

anticipate its coming. They may therefore be classed with the two groups just mentioned. We find the verb frequently accompanied by such adverbs as *ecce*, *ibi*, *interibi*, *ilico*, *extemplo*, *subito*, and *forte*. The examples of this use of the present are, as we should expect, numerous in comedy.<sup>1</sup>

"Lucernam forte oblitus fueram extinguere:  
At ille clamat derepente maxumum."

—PLAUT. *Most.* 487-88

"Nam ut numerabatur forte argentum, intervenit  
Homo de improvviso."

—TER. *Ad.* 406-7

Under this head belongs also the present with *cum inversum*, which is the usual tense in the early and classical period.<sup>2</sup>

4. Equally incapable of control is action springing from intense emotion or excitement. Fear, hate, joy, pain, and anger will take their own instantaneous course, and the historical present is very common.<sup>3</sup>

Quem perterriti omnes Arverni circumsistunt atque obsecrant ut suis fortunis consulat neu se ab hostibus diripi patiat. —CAES. *BG.* vii. 8. 4.

5. Very similar is the more consciously directed action resulting from a strong impulse, desire, or determination, and the instantaneous carrying-out of a plan or purpose. The persistence of the action is often expressed by pairs of synonyms (*petunt atque orant*, *petit atque hortatur*, etc.).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Other examples: Plaut. *Amph.* 1064, 1068, 1090, 1094, 1108-9; *Asin.* 343; *Cas.* 41; *Curc.* 337, 349, 648; *Merc.* 100, 201, 256, 260; *Mil.* 104, 118; *Most.* 1050; *Poen.* 1284; *Stich.* 371; *Trin.* 168; Ter. *Hec.* 39; *Phorm.* 91, 617, 861; Hor. *Sat.* i. 7. 54-55, i. 9. 74; Cicero *Ver.* iii. 88; *Mil.* 28; Plin. *Ep.* iii. 14. 2; Livy *xxi.* 14 and 36.

<sup>2</sup> Bennett (*Syntax of Early Latin*, I, 84) cites five cases for early Latin, of which four have the present. Caesar has three with the present and one with the perfect. Sallust has four with the present. Other examples with the present: Livy i. 25. 8; ii. 25. 3; xxii. 21. 6; xxvii. 28. 11; xxix. 7. 8; xxxiii. 15. 6; Cicero *Phil.* xiii. 19; *Ver.* ii. 72 and 75; iii. 36; v. 161; *Sest.* 32 and 79; *ND.* i. 79; *Div.* i. 13; Hor. *Sat.* i. 5. 20; ii. 6. 101 and 111; Petron. xxvii. 1; xxxiv. 1; xcii. 1; cxxxvi. 7; Plin. *Ep.* i. 12. 10; vi. 16. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Plaut. *Amph.* 1093; *Cas.* 932; *Men.* 42; Ter. *Andr.* 132-33; Cic. *Caec.* 22; *Sest.* 28; *Pison.* 93; Caes. *BG.* v. 31; v. 37. 3; Livy i. 23. 4 (*ferox—pergit*); i. 25. 13; i. 26. 3; i. 28. 8; i. 30. 4; ii. 18. 9; Petron. lxxxii. 1; xciv. 9; xcvi. 2; xcix. 2; cviii. 3; Sal. *Iug.* liii. 8; Virg. *Aen.* ii. 314.

<sup>4</sup> Plaut. *Amph.* 205; *Aul.* 573; *Capt.* 37; Ter. *Hec.* 38 and 121; *Phorm.* 373; Cic. *Ver.* iii. 136; *Cat.* iii. 6; *Caec.* 20 and 21; Sal. *Jug.* liv. 6; lix. 1; lxi. 3; lxxv. 3-6; Hor. *Sat.* i. 9. 76-77; Livy i. 28. 3, 7, and 10; i. 24. 6; i. 32. 2; i. 58. 11; ii. 12. 5.

"Haec ubi dicta  
Agrestem pepulere, domo levis exsilit; inde  
Ambo propositum peragunt iter."

—HOR. *Sat.* ii. 6. 97-99

"Statuit . . . . alio more bellum gerendum. Itaque in loca Numidia  
opulentissima pergit, agros vastat, multa castella et oppida temere munita  
. . . . capit incenditque, puberes interfici iubet."—SAL. *Jug.* liv. 6.

6. Akin to these forms of action is the spontaneous emotional reaction to a situation or a happening in which the spectator is deeply concerned.<sup>1</sup>

Hic lacrimis vitam damus et miserescimus ultro.

—VIRG. *Aen.* ii. 145

The response may be merely formal, a matter of polite behavior, as in applause at the end of a speech.<sup>2</sup>

"Sophos" universi clamamus et sublati manibus ad cameram iuramus.—PETRON. xl. i.

7. An act may be directly called forth by a previous act as the obvious response to it, prompted by the setting or an accepted pattern of behavior, as, for instance, the obedient performance of a command.<sup>3</sup>

Quod iussi sunt faciunt.—CAES. *BG* iii. 6. 1.

The commonest form of such response is that of conversation. Certain verbs of saying employed for this purpose (*inquit, infit, ait*) have from long use become stereotyped and are rarely found except in the present tense. Other words used to indicate the turns in a conversation (*rogo, respondeo, dico, quaero*, etc.) are also found in the present tense with very great frequency.<sup>4</sup>

8. A situation may be such that a particular result follows as a natural consequence.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plaut. *Curc.* 648; Virg. *Aen.* i. 92-94, 464-65, 661-62, 709; ii. 31-32; Livy i. 25. 9; i. 26. 3; Ter. *Hec.* 368.

<sup>2</sup> Livy i. 28. 1; Petron. xxxvi. 4; lii. 7; xlvii. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Ter. *Heaut.* 305-6; *Phorm.* 863; *Andr.* 353-55; *Hec.* 188; Plaut. *Cas.* 59; *Asin.* 351-53; *Amph.* 218, 244-46; *Capt.* 478-84; Virg. *Aen.* i. 689; Livy i. 23. 10; i. 24. 3; i. 26. 1; i. 28. 1; Hor. *Sat.* i. 9. 62 and 76-77.

<sup>4</sup> Plaut. *Amph.* 213-14; *Asin.* 344-47; *Capt.* 511-14; *Curc.* 338-42, 596-97; *Epid.* 245; Ter. *Phorm.* 113-14; *Ad.* 619-20; *Andr.* 147, 358; *Hec.* 185-89; Hor. *Sat.* i. 7. 20-35; Cic. *Ver.* ii. 127; iv. 32; iv. 147; v. 102.

<sup>5</sup> Sal. *Jug.* xlii. 9; xviii. 3; lii. 5; liii. 2. Caes. *BG* v. 3. 5; v. 5. 2; v. 10. 2; v. 25. 3; v. 28. 1; Liv. i. 25. 13; i. 22. 5; i. 23. 1 and 10; i. 34. 7; i. 25. 7 and 9; i. 27. 4, 7, 8, and 10; i. 33. 8; Plaut. *Amph.* 247, 256-58, 1111, 1115; *Bacch.* 300-301, 305; *Curc.* 683; Ter. *Ad.* 472, 619; *Hec.* 190-91; *Heaut.* 122-24; *Phorm.* 135.

"Quom interea rumor venit  
Datum iri gladiatores, populus convolat,  
Tumultuantur clamant pugnant de loco."

—TER. *Hec.* 39-41

"Senatus, ita uti par fuerat, decernit suo atque populi iniussu nullum potuisse foedus fieri."—SAL. *Jug.* xxxix. 3.

Under this head, or under the preceding one, may be classed acts performed in obedience to custom.<sup>1</sup>

Funus interim  
Procedit; sequimur; ad sepulcrum venimus;  
In ignem impositast; fletur.

—TER. *Andr.* 127-29

9. Something very similar to the creating of a situation may be accomplished by the narrator when he introduces his account of what actually happened by a preparatory remark—usually a partial or general statement—which puts the reader or hearer on the track of what is coming. The concrete event will appear to spring from the preparatory statement quite as inevitably as it would from an actual antecedent situation.<sup>2</sup>

Consilio etiam additus dolus. Spurius Tarpeius Romanae praeerat arci; huius filiam virginem auro corrumpit Tati. —LIVY i. 11. 6.

10. The removal of an obstacle or difficulty, the release from a previous denial or obligation, the abandonment of opposition, a renewal of effort, a new opportunity, may all open the way for prompt action, which, in comparison with the preceding delay, will seem quite sweeping and inevitable.<sup>3</sup>

"Lucius Tarquinius et Tullia minor prope continuatis funeribus cum domos vacuas novo matrimonio fecissent, iunguntur nuptiis."—LIVY i. 46. 9.

"Nos maius veriti, postquam nihil esse periculi  
sensimus, erigimur."

—HOR. *Sat.* ii. 8. 57-58

<sup>1</sup> *Andria.* 115, 117; Cic. *Ver.* iv. 142; Caes. *BG* v. 37. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Plaut. *Capt.* 500-502; Ter. *Andr.* 282-85, 353; *Phorm.* 111 ff.; Cic. *Ver.* ii. 42, 37, 59, 71, 89, 94, 95, 68, 128; iii. 92; *Flac.* 91; *Sest.* 71-72, 75; *Quinct.* 61; *Cluent.* 18, 27, 38; *Caec.* 15; Livy i. 14. 2; i. 23. 3 and 5; ii. 20. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Ter. *Phorm.* 116; *Hec.* 135; Caes. *BG* i. 9. 2; i. 11. 2; vi. 7. 4; Cic. *Ver.* iv. 85. 94, 149; iii. 78; Hor. *Sat.* i. 7. 81-89; Livy i. 27. 9; i. 15. 4; i. 16. 3; i. 42. 4; i. 45. 7; i. 32. 3; Petron. *lxii.* 2.



11. Finally, when an account has been begun in the historical present, it is natural and easy to continue it in that form. The same law which operates in what we call the subjunctive by attraction and the sequence of tenses will operate here also. It was no doubt a major influence helping to fix the present as the prevailing tense of narration in the epic, where, once established, it could do much to assist the hexameter in producing its sustained uniformity of tone. It will account in large measure for the curious phenomenon that Caesar sometimes tells of one campaign largely by the present, and of another almost entirely by the perfect.<sup>1</sup> Similar blocks of narrative, confined largely to one tense or the other, are found elsewhere also.<sup>2</sup>

This continuation of an account by a succession of present tenses is made easy also by the inconclusive force of the present as compared with the perfect. Since it is not in the nature of the present to express the end of the act, a succession of verbs in this tense inevitably conveys a certain expectant attitude of mind, looking forward to what is to come. This attitude is well expressed by the insistent question of the listener: *Quid fit deinde?* or *Quid fit denique?* He is so completely under the spell of the narrator's manner that he uses the present tense in his question also.<sup>3</sup>

To sum up briefly what appears to be the function of the historical present in narration, it reflects the immediate and inevitable passage from one act or situation to another which grows naturally and directly out of it or represents a spontaneous reaction or response to it. That the movement is swift and not to a great extent subject to the control of the mind appears from the simple structure of the sentences,

<sup>1</sup> Divided by campaigns, the Gallic War supplies these figures:

	Present	Perfect
i. 1-29 (Helvetians).....	78	78
30-54 (Ariovistus).....	5	152
ii. 1-35 (Belgians).....	16	110
iii. 1-16 (Veneti).....	26	25
17-28 (minor).....	15	45
iv. 1-19 (Germany).....	7	55
20-38 (Britain).....	12	86
v. 1-23 (Britain).....	51	73
24-58 (Ambiorix).....	181	65
vi. 1-28 (minor).....	65	15
29-44 (Ambiorix).....	72	39
vii. 1-90 (Vercingetorix).....	367	196

<sup>2</sup> Of the historical present: Cic. *Quinct.* 14-30; *Ver.* ii. 68-77, 89-98; iii. 135-40; iv. 39-41, 94-96; v. 91-96; *Sal. Jug.* 21-23, 25-28, 56-68; *Livy* i. 27-28, 40-41, 45, 55-57; *Plin. Ep.* vii. 27; ix. 13 and 33; *Tac. Ann.* i. 48-51.

<sup>3</sup> *Plaut. Amph.* 1098, 1119; *Cas.* 914; *Bacch.* 294; *Truc.* 401; *Ter. Heaut.* 655; *Hec.* 143; *Phorm.* 642; *Hec.* 267; Cic. *Quinct.* 66; *Ver.* v. 14.

the relative scarcity of expressions showing the relation between them, and the comparative infrequency of modifiers or subordinate clauses introducing matters not closely in line with the events being narrated. The inevitable and predetermined character of this passage from act to act, from cause to effect, is warrant for including under the same general head also those happenings which are in themselves not subject to control or modification, such as the workings of fate and the gods, the fixed permanence of historical facts, and the sudden and unexpected event. These are inevitable *per se*, not merely inevitable as the result or effect of something else.

### III

To make the difference in function between the historical present and the historical perfect still more clear, we may briefly pass in review the characteristic uses of the latter, also, as distinct from the former. For it is these two tenses which are rivals, so to speak, in the narrative field, the imperfect and pluperfect performing more special functions of their own. There will be much common ground between the present and the perfect, occupied now by the one and now by the other. The individual author will often make his own choice, and the inclination to continue automatically with the form once adopted will be strong. Since the difference between the two is so largely subjective, a matter of conception and mental attitude, this will inevitably be so. But the difference will be no less real for all that.

The perfect, having to do at all times with things of the past, is associated with a practice of greater leisureliness and deliberation than the present. The material, as we have said, is already before the narrator in its complete extent; it is not, as in the case of the present, seen as just coming into being. There is no occasion, consequently, for speed to keep up with the passing details of the action. The details may be realized and represented in their individual character and in their relation to one another, as the author has come to see them. They may be so manipulated as to bring out these characteristics and affinities.

The perfect is, then, as we should expect, the tense of biography as opposed to history, of exposition as opposed to narration. Suetonius, the typical Latin biographer, makes only scant use of the pres

ent, and when he does so confines himself to a strictly limited number of verbs. The first five biographies yield *petit*, *redit*, *init*, *perit*, *circuit*, *trahit*, *vomit*, *creatur*, *aperitur*, *recitatur*, and *adoptatur*. Only the first two of these are found more than once. The first five may be contracted perfect forms.<sup>1</sup> A similar state of things is found in the *Agricola* of Tacitus, in spite of its wide divergence in other respects. It has only four historical presents, used once each: *deducit*, *praecipit*, *iubet*, and *populatur*—a practice which contrasts sharply with the extensive use of the tense in the *Histories* and *Annals*. In Nepos most of the brief biographies, which do not allow much room for narration, do not have the historical present at all. But neither do those of the longer ones which follow the biographical pattern closely—the *Epaminondas*, the *Agesilaus*, and the *Atticus*. The others have the historical present in the customary manner of historical prose, when a passage of swift narration occurs. Velleius, in whom the rhetorical and eulogistic element is prominent, has the same scattering instances of the present as biography does (*occiditur*, *patitur*, *expellitur*, *conditur*, *occupat*, *reducitur*), and only two extended passages near the end, where the treatment is fuller (ii. 118 and 120).<sup>2</sup>

The special uses of the historical perfect which distinguish it from the historical present are all in harmony with what we have just found to be its use in biography.

1. It is found—along with the imperfect and pluperfect—in passages introduced by way of comment, explanation, or additional information. Although the matters presented are often events that occur in the course of the narrative, they appear rather as something supplied by the narrator apart from it and for a special purpose. The conjunction *nam*, which is commonly used to introduce an explanation, is found in Caesar, Sallust, and Tacitus more than ten times as frequently with the perfect as with the present.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The practice of Suetonius is, as we should expect, rather slavishly followed by the writers of the *Historia Augusta*.

<sup>2</sup> The merely occasional use of the present by these authors and their individual fondness for certain verbs and endings, and particularly for the passive, which is elsewhere relatively uncommon, suggests the conclusion that their use of the tense may have been due to something besides the force which it commonly has in narration. But we cannot pursue the subject further at this time.

<sup>3</sup> Even though the two tenses are elsewhere, in Caesar and Sallust, employed in about equal number, while in Tacitus the present is used about half as frequently as the perfect.

"Hoc pugnae tempus magnum attulit nostris ad salutem momentum."—  
CAES. *BC* i. 51. 6.

"Nemo ridet. Scivi extemplo rem de compecto geri."

—PLAUT. *Capt.* 484

2. The perfect is common in general, comprehensive, or summary statements of events which may also, either before or after, be given in more detail. Such statements are, in comedy, often introduced by phrases like *Quid verbis opus?*<sup>1</sup>

Quasumque postea controversias inter se milites habuerunt, sua sponte ad Caesarem in ius adierunt.—CAES. *BC* i. 87. 2.

3. A final act or event representing the conclusion or consummation of a preceding activity or series of acts or events will be in the perfect as a rule. Certain verbs (*consisto, desisto, desino, conficio, perficio*, etc.) which themselves express the completion or ceasing of a previous action will, in the nature of things, appear more often in the perfect than in the present.<sup>2</sup>

"Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata."—LIVY i. 7. 3.

4. The perfect is much more common than the present in passages involving careful distinction and specification. Double conjunctions like *et—et, nec—nec, non solum—sed etiam*, and other words of similar function, have the perfect much more often than the present.<sup>3</sup>

Id non modo tum scripserunt, verum etiam in aere incisum nobis tradiderunt.—CIC. *Ver.* iv. 145.

5. Any elaborate statement of the nature, intensity, or extent of an activity or situation is more likely to be put into the perfect. Such are statements involving large numbers or quantities, expressions of comparison (*tantus—quantus*), and especially statements indicating the nature or degree of an act (*tantus ut, ita ut, adeo ut*, etc.). Sentences containing such *ut*-clauses have, in Caesar, the perfect 68 times, the

<sup>1</sup> The passages are: *Bacch.* 483; *Poen.* 113; *Rud.* 85, 135; *Amph.* 615; *Aul.* 472; *Cist.* 94; *Most.* 993; *Merc.* 106; *Men.* 484; *Andr.* 99; *Eun.* 632; *Phorm.* 75. Cf. also the perfect with *accervatim* and *summam* (Cic. *Clu.* 19 and 30).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Plaut. *Curc.* 359–62; Ter. *Phorm.* 878–81; and Caes. *BC* i. 87. 3.

<sup>3</sup> A count of the usage of Caesar, Sallust, and Tacitus shows the two tenses used as follows: *et—et* (perfect 62—present 13); *nec—nec* (25—6); *alter—alter* (22—0); *non solum* (*non tantum*, etc.)—*sed etiam* (59—18).

present 13 times; in Sallust, the perfect 11 times, the present once; in Tacitus, the perfect 57 times, the present 9 times.

"Quindecim milia Romanorum in acie caesa; decem milia sparsa fuga per omnem Etruriam diversis itineribus urbem petiere; duo milia quingenti hostium in acie, multi postea vulneribus periire."—LIVY xxii. 7.

"Immutat nomen avos huic gemino alteri.

Ita illum dilexit qui subruptust alterum."

—PLAUT. *Men.* 40-41

6. An opposing fact, a statement modifying one previously made, is also regularly in the perfect. The record of perfect and present with *sed* is: Caesar, 52-17; Sallust, 53-17; Tacitus, 103-22; with *tamen*: Caesar, 25-7; Sallust, 12-5; Tacitus, 94-6.

7. Statements declaring an obligation, necessity, or possibility, conclusions and expressions of judgment on the part of the narrator, assertions of a quality in a person or thing, and negative statements generally—in short, all statements of anything normally arrived at by discrimination or reasoning rather than direct observation or experience—are very rarely found in the historical present,<sup>1</sup> but regularly in the perfect. The special verbs in this list are fairly numerous, including *sum* and its compounds, the various modal auxiliaries, and many other words and phrases of similar meaning.

"Quod fuit illis conandum atque omni ratione efficiendum."—CAES. *BC* i. 65. 5.

"Vocat me ad cenam: religio fuit, denegare nolui."

—PLAUT. *Curc.* 350

8. Verbs of thinking, perceiving, feeling, choosing, desiring, and the like, are all commonly found in the perfect. *Putavit*, *existimavit*, *intellexit*, *sensit*, *visum est*, *placuit*, *voluit*, etc., are all far more common than the present forms, if the latter are found at all, in the narration of past events. The explanation, no doubt, is that the knowledge of another person's mental activity is not obtained directly through the senses, but only by drawing a conclusion from his actions and by comparison with our own more or less similar experience.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

<sup>1</sup> The fairly frequent use of the present in fixed expressions like *quantum potest* can hardly be considered an exception.

## THE LUPERCALIA IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

By WILLIAM M. GREEN

THE remark is often made that the Lupercalia was among the most long-lived of pagan institutions, lasting till near the close of the fifth century, long after the old pagan worship was legally suppressed. While this is true, the references to the Lupercalia of this period found in well-known works are often distinctly uncritical. For example, Pope Hilary is said in A.D. 467 to have demanded the abolition of the festival from the Emperor Anthemius,<sup>1</sup> whereas the sources state only that the Pope warned the Emperor against tolerating heresies,<sup>2</sup> and that the Lupercalia had continued through the time of Anthemius.<sup>3</sup> Again, in almost all the discussions of the institution it is said that Pope Gelasius in 494 converted the pagan festival into the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin (Candlemas). This conjecture of Cardinal Baronius<sup>4</sup> was based on the fact that Gelasius had suppressed the pagan festival, and that the *quadagesima Epiphaniae* (February 14), the earliest form of the Christian festival, so nearly coincided with its date, February 15. Usener and later writers on Christian ritual<sup>5</sup> have recognized Baronius' mistake, in that the *quadagesima Epiphaniae* was never celebrated in Rome, and that the date of Candlemas, which must follow Christmas with an interval of forty days, could never in the West have been

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Frazer, *Fasts of Ovid* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1929), II, 328, follows H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*<sup>4</sup> (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1903), I, 287, who in turn follows Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, IV, chap. xxxvi, 32 ff. (ed. Bury; New York: Macmillan, 1898). Gibbon and Milman are equivocal as to Hilary's protest against the Lupercalia, while Frazer makes the unqualified assertion. Bury offers no correction in Gibbon's statement.

<sup>2</sup> Avell. in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (ed. Guenther; Vienna: Tempsky, 1895), XXXV, 390 f.

<sup>3</sup> Avell., p. 457, 20.

<sup>4</sup> C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Barri-Ducis; L. Guerin, 1864-83), IX, 603.

<sup>5</sup> H. Usener, *Weihnachtsfest* (Bonn: Cohen, 1889), p. 318; T. Barnes, "Candlemas" in Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner's, 1908-27), III, 190; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*<sup>6</sup> (London: SPCK, 1923), p. 271.

other than February 2. Yet such scholars as Marquardt, Fowler, Schanz, and Frazer<sup>1</sup> continue to follow the sixteenth-century cardinal.

There is no doubt but that the Lupercalia continued till the time of Pope Gelasius (A.D. 494-96). It is mentioned by Augustine in the latter part of the *City of God*<sup>2</sup> (written not far from 426), and it is included in the calendar of the Christian Polemius Silvius, of 448/9.<sup>3</sup> When it was finally abolished by the efforts of Gelasius, he addressed to a group of senators an epistle defending the step, which approximates the length of an apologetic treatise.<sup>4</sup> He admits that the old pagan rite had continued under his predecessors, through the days of Alaric, Anthemius, and Ricimer, and had been abolished only in his own time;<sup>5</sup> but he defends the earlier popes by saying that all ills could not be healed at once, and that perhaps they had tried to remove this superstition but had failed to win the support of the imperial court.<sup>6</sup>

Those who pleaded for the restoration of the performance were all members of the bishop's spiritual flock,<sup>7</sup> and it was evidently through such persons that the rites had been carried on during the preceding century of Christian rule. In a long series of laws, commencing with the year 341, pagan worship had been forbidden, especially the sacrifices, such as were characteristic of the Lupercalia; and the severest penalties were prescribed.<sup>8</sup> The last organized resistance by the pagans was crushed by Theodosius I at the battle of the Frigidus in 394,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1878), III, 427; W. W. Fowler, *Roman Festivals* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1899), p. 321; M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (München: Beck, 1920), IV, Part II, 603; Frazer, *loc. cit.* So also in a Columbia dissertation, A. M. Franklin, *The Lupercalia* (New York, 1921).

<sup>2</sup> *Civ.* xviii. 12. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *CIL*, I, 259.

<sup>4</sup> *Epist.* 100—Avell. pp. 453-64.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 461, 2. 23 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 462, 23-464, 4. His belief that the earlier popes had made such an effort is twice qualified (*forsitan, fortasse*) in a manner overlooked by Gibbon and those who follow him (cf. n. 1 above, p. 60).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 454, 10; 463, 5-15, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 2-25; *et al.* Cf. the collection of laws, in translation, by M. A. Huttman, "The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism," in *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, LX, Part II, 169-249.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. Geffcken, *Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1920), pp. 160-62.



while the subsequent process of suppressing the pagan cult, with the occasional riots resulting, is well illustrated by the letters of St. Augustine.<sup>1</sup> From all the sources it would appear that the public observance of pagan rites was effectually suppressed by 408. The Lupercalia, then, must belong to the class of superstitions which lingered on among a nominally Christian people. Something of the nature of this superstition may be learned from the letter of Pope Gelasius cited above.

1. *As to the purpose of the Lupercalia.*—A pestilence had broken out in Campania, which Andromachus and other senators ascribed to the suppression of the Lupercalia. The Pope replied that the purpose of the festival was not to avert pestilence but to promote the fertility of women; that pestilence and ills of every sort had been abundant while the Lupercalia continued; and that there was no connection between a city festival and happenings in Campania.<sup>2</sup>

This reply raises a question as to the purpose of the rites. Gelasius cites an account from the second decade of Livy (292–218 B.C.), to the effect that the Lupercalia was instituted to relieve the sterility of Roman matrons.<sup>3</sup> The service thus rendered by the scourging of the Luperci is mentioned by many writers. But a number of sources indicate that the Lupercalia was, in a wider sense, a festival of purification. It was the most important event of the month of February, which received its name from the purification (*februare* = "to purify").<sup>4</sup> The day of the Lupercalia was known as the *dies februatus*, or "Purified Day."<sup>5</sup> The course taken by the runners was a lustration of the ancient Palatine settlement;<sup>6</sup> but in historic times its benefits were extended to the entire city,<sup>7</sup> so that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Roman inhabitants of outlying districts felt their interests involved.

<sup>1</sup> *Epist.* 50. 90. 91. 96. 97. 103. 104. Cf. E. F. Humphrey, *Politics and Religion in the Days of Augustine* (New York: Columbia Diss., 1912).

<sup>2</sup> Avell., pp. 454, 12 ff.; 456, 23–457, 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 457, 4 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *CIL*, I<sup>3</sup>, 259; Pol. *Silv. fast. Febr. tit.*; Varro *Ling.* vi. 34; Ov. *Fast.* ii. 31 f.; Censor. xxii 14 f.; Paul. *Fest.* p. 85; Dio. Hal. i. 80; Plut. *Numa* xix. 5; Lydus *de Mensibus* iv. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Varro, Censor. *loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Varro *loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup> Ov., Censor. *loc. cit.*

Such rituals of purification are among the commonest of all magical or religious practices designed, as Frazer says,<sup>1</sup> "to repel the powers of evil and so to liberate the powers of good, thus promoting the fertility at once of man, of beast, and of the earth." So the Lupercalia was believed to make provision for the growth of crops,<sup>2</sup> coming at a season appropriate for that purpose. In the Roman ritual a number of festivals belong to this class, and on the occasion of *prodigia* extraordinary lustrations took place.<sup>3</sup> Two writers have preserved for us versions of the prayer that accompanied the lustration of a Roman estate, which show clearly the aim to avert all forms of evil. When the farmer has given orders for the hog, sheep, and ox of the *suovetaurilia* to be led about his farm, he prays to Father Mars to keep off diseases, sterility, destruction, calamities, and bad weather ("morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque"), allowing the crops to grow to an abundant harvest, preserving shepherds and flocks, giving health to master and household.<sup>4</sup> Festus includes a request for the averting of pestilence, disease, death, ruin, vapors, and the scab ("pesestas . . . morbum, mortem, labem, nebulam, impetiginem").<sup>5</sup>

So firmly intrenched were such superstitions of the mob that in 397 a group of Christian missionaries in Anaunia, north of the Po, were slain for attempting to prevent the lustral ceremony.<sup>6</sup>

The Lupercalia was the best known and most spectacular of such purifications. It persisted through a century of Christian rule, while the others, so far as we know, disappeared, or were remodeled and adopted into the calendar of the church.<sup>7</sup> It would be quite natural for it to take over, somewhat, the functions of those that were lost. Thus the suppression of a pestilence on Campanian estates would more properly be a function of the *ambarvalia*, but was now associated with the Lupercalia. How seriously people believed in such an association we cannot tell. The Pope scoffs at the idea, yet thought it necessary to write an answer in several thousand words.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 335.

<sup>2</sup> Lydus *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup> (München: Beck, 1912), pp. 390 f.

<sup>4</sup> Cato *agr.* 141.

<sup>5</sup> Paul. Fest., p. 210 s.v. *pesestas*.

<sup>6</sup> Max. Taur. *Serm.* 81; Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 101, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Usener has argued that the latter was the case with the *Ambarvalia*, *Amburbale*, and *Robigalia*. *Weihnachtsfest*, pp. 296-303; Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 101, n. 5.

2. *The deity honored.*—The Pope describes the rites as a worship of demons, a propitiatory sacrifice to the February god—"quia daemonia non colantur et deo Februario non litetur."<sup>1</sup>

The god of the Lupercalia is given many names—Faunus, Pan, Lupercus, Lycaeus, Inuus—even Bacchus and Juno are mentioned—but the name of the month is nowhere else applied to the god. Late writers refer to a Februus, the personification of the month, who is once named as honored by the Luperi.<sup>2</sup> There was, in fact, no general agreement as to the identity of the god. This leads to the modern suggestion that the Lupercalia was originally a magical rather than a religious rite, and hence did not involve a reference to any particular deity.<sup>3</sup> This would help to explain its survival in the fifth century, among the many other magical practices which the church continued to combat through the centuries. The adjective *Februarius* might serve as a description of the unnamed spirit who presided over the month of purification and its principal festival, and would be less distinctively pagan than the name of any god formerly connected with the rites.

Gelasius, however, was acquainted somewhat further with the half-animal nature of this *daemon*, describing his worshipers as "digni, qui monstrum nescio quod pecudis hominisque mixtura compositum, sive vere sive false editum celebretis."<sup>4</sup> One thinks at once of his identification with Pan or Faunus, and of the statue set up in the Lupercal, nude except for the goat-skin about his loins, just as the Luperi appeared in the festival.<sup>5</sup> Such creatures—Panes, fauns, silvans, werewolves, and a myriad of others—abound in the folk lore of all ages, and we may be sure were a part of the superstitions of the fifth century. It is strictly in accord with the tradition of Christian apologists that the Pope viewed these spirits as *daemonia* ("demons") and seriously regards the possibility that the strange monster of the Lupercalia was a reality. For Augustine the existence of *Sylvanos et Panes*, and their relations with women, is a matter proved by indubitable testimony.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, he follows Varro in believing that men have

<sup>1</sup> Avell., p. 454, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Lydus *loc. cit.*; Steuding in Roscher's *Lexikon*, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> Frazer, *op. cit.*, II, 335.

<sup>4</sup> Avell., p. 460, 26 f.

<sup>5</sup> Just. xliii. 1, 7.

<sup>6</sup> C<sup>ir</sup>. xv. 23; cf. Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 211, n. 6.

been transformed into wolves in the rites of the Arcadian Pan Lycaeus, from whose mysteries the Roman Luperci take their origin.<sup>1</sup>

Christians believed that these demons were wholly evil, and such may well have been the view even of those members of Gelasius' flock who desired to continue the superstitious practices. The issue was not as to the reality of the demons, but as to whether evils should be averted by demon-worship and magic arts, which were regarded as one and the same thing.<sup>2</sup>

3. *The Luperci*.—The most familiar feature of the Lupercalia was the spectacle of the nude Luperci running to and fro, a feature that is noted in the letter of Gelasius. But it seems that the runners to whom the senators would intrust the ritual were not of the rank chosen in antiquity. In Caesar's time noble youths and magistrates felt no shame in playing the part, even the consul Antony appearing conspicuously in 44 B.C.<sup>3</sup> Under Augustus, membership in the two colleges of Luperci was awarded, as a mark of honor, to selected youths of equestrian rank.<sup>4</sup> The Christian nobles of Gelasius' time, however, would commit the function to men of the lowest class—"ad viles trivialesque personas, abiectos et infimos"; they are not even given the name Luperci.<sup>5</sup>

To this part of their proposal the Pope makes a taunting reply: such a performance is not the ancient rite at all, and would have no efficacy whatever. "If you assert that this rite has salutary force, celebrate it yourselves in the ancestral fashion; run nude yourselves that you may properly carry out the mockery!" Their unwillingness to do so was a confession that it was a shameful institution in which no Christian of dignity could engage.<sup>6</sup>

The degradation of the ritual is also referred to as a matter of the past. The Pope maintained that the adherents of the superstition had corrupted the cult in having it performed by improper persons, so that now, if anything was to be done, a complete renewal (*instauratio*) was needed to repair matters.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Civ.* xviii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* viii. 17-22.

<sup>3</sup> *Plut. Anton.* 12.

<sup>4</sup> *Val. Max.* ii. 2, 9; *Wissowa, op. cit.*, p. 561.

<sup>5</sup> *Avell.*, p. 458, 25.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 458, 26-459, 11 *et saepe*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 462, 5 ff.

When Gratian in 382 expropriated the property and income of the pagan priesthoods, revoked their immunities, and forbade all future gifts,<sup>1</sup> the structure of the ancient priestly colleges must have rapidly collapsed. The prohibition of pagan-worship made their profession illegal,<sup>2</sup> and as outlaws they were driven from metropolitan cities.<sup>3</sup> All this rendered the continuance of the equestrian colleges of Luperci quite out of the question. Popular superstition led to the continuance of some form of the rite; but persons of standing were reluctant to make the required display, and left that task to the vulgar.

4. *The songs*.—As to the sportive behavior of the performers, Gelasius' letter gives a suggestion of unique interest. It appears that a minister of the church had been guilty of adultery, and the same senators that urged the continuance of the Lupercalia demanded also that an example be made of the offending cleric.<sup>4</sup> Now the connection between the two demands is not explicitly stated, but it seems implied that the offender was to be humiliated by having his crime made the subject of public jesting at the Lupercalia. That festival is characterized as a matter of jesting and vile songs ("ludibrii et cantilenarum turpium"), a religious observance which is celebrated by remarks of obscenity and of crimes ("quae obscenitatum et flagitiorum vocibus celebratur"). Its defenders argued that by carrying out this practice and publishing the misdeeds of everyone ("haec agendo et facinora uniuscuiusque vulgando"), men were deterred from such deeds and checked by shame, fearing that they would become the subject of public song ("ne de his publica voce cantetur"). The only misdeeds mentioned are those of the guilty cleric.

The Pope replies that such a performance rather destroys shame and suggests criminal conduct. Jestng serves not to repress evil but as an occasion for merrymaking. One is actually affording a service to such a religion in committing the misdeeds which may be taken as the subjects of song. Thus the festival, like the whole pagan system, is grossly immoral.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Huttmeun, *op. cit.*, pp. 192 f.; Geffcken, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 f.; Wissowa, *op. cit.* p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 14 (396 A.D.).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xvi. 10. 20 (415 A.D.).

<sup>4</sup> Avell., p. 455, 23 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 459, 19-460, 20.

The sportive license of the Lupercalia is frequently mentioned in the classical literature,<sup>1</sup> but without referring to the subject matter of jests. When merrymaking takes the form of obscene verses, it is natural that these are made use of to lampoon anyone who appears a suitable target. The abuses thus growing out of the licentious Fescennine verses led to legal prohibitions.<sup>2</sup>

The licentious character of the pagan festivals is constantly attacked by the Christian apologists, and, we may be sure, was dear to the pagans. An opportunity such as was here afforded to make merry at the expense of a Christian minister would appeal strongly to those who loved the old superstitions, and would meet with a most spirited resistance on the part of the church.

5. *The sacrifices*.—The protest of the senators was made because propitiatory sacrifice was not being made to the February god ("quia deo Februario non litetur"), a phrase also used by the Pope to describe the sacrifice of olden times.<sup>3</sup> The word *litare* means to sacrifice, or to propitiate by means of sacrifice, and is regularly applied to offerings of victims, incense, or sacrificial meal. In a transferred sense it may mean "propitiate, appease." Thus in the Vulgate it is used of propitiating God by a life of righteousness,<sup>4</sup> and in Tertullian of reverence to God.<sup>5</sup> The letter of Gelasius gives no clue as to whether the February god was to be propitiated by the ancient sacrifice of goats, dog, and *mola salsa*, or by other means.

On the one hand, the goat-sacrifice and the skins of the slaughtered animals played such an essential part in the festival that they would seem quite inseparable from it, especially since the god himself remained *monstrum pecudis hominisque mixtura compositum*. On the other, this long continuance of animal sacrifice, which was the central object of Christian attack, seems incredible. A law of 392, for example, distinguished between the immolation of a victim or consulting of entrails, as crimes punishable by death; and other acts, such as offering incense, setting up altars, etc., as punishable by a fine.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *Phil.* xiii. 31; Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 560, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Hor. *Epist.* ii. 1. 145-55. Cf. Mart. i. 4. 3 f.

<sup>3</sup> Avell., pp. 454, 13; 456, 28.

<sup>4</sup> Vulg. *Sirach* xxv. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Tert. *Patient.* 10.

<sup>6</sup> Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 12. Cf. xvi. 10. 10. 25. Novell. Theod. iii. 8; Cod. Just. i. 11. 7.

The bishops and clergy were everywhere active in promoting the enforcement of the laws, and it is difficult to believe that the bloody sacrifice was annually and publicly performed in Christian Rome, the seat of apostolic authority. If the animals were still slaughtered in Gelasius' day, we should expect him to denounce that abomination while pointing out, as he does, the inconsistency of the rite with the Christian profession.

In defense of the performance it was urged that it was a mere shadow (*imago*) of the ancient pagan festival. The Pope agrees, but replies that if the genuine ceremony, performed *ritu integro*, was worthless, how much more so the shadow!<sup>1</sup> The changes referred to in these words include the matter of the selection of the runners, but the words are more appropriate if applying to more extensive changes, such as the suppression of the animal sacrifice.

One passage of doubtful text may have a bearing on this question. According to the MS the Pope challenges the nobles, "*ipsi cum \*ridiculo\* nudi discurrere.*"<sup>2</sup> Guenther offers the emendation *resticulo*, a rare word found in the Digest and in Ambrose.<sup>3</sup> If this conjecture is right, it would mean that the runners carried cords instead of the ancient goat-skin thongs, and would imply that the sacrifice had ceased.

6. *The flagellation.*—Some change had occurred in the scourging inflicted by the runners, since this, like the running of the nobles, is described as a thing of the past. "*Apud illos enim nobiles ipsi currebant et matronae nudato publice corpore vapulabant.*"<sup>4</sup> Nowhere else is it said that matrons bared their bodies to the scourge. In the time of Juvenal and Plutarch women offered the palms of their hands, like children in school.<sup>5</sup> Ovid, however, in describing the origin of this practice, says the girls were bidden to offer their backs to be beaten.<sup>6</sup> Gelasius, as we have noted, cites Livy as to the occasion when this feature of the ritual was instituted, and must owe his knowledge of the exposure of the body by the matrons to the same, or a similar, source. It is altogether likely that such a rude practice would give way, and be replaced by that described as usual in classical times.

<sup>1</sup> Avell., p. 462, 9-14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 458, 28.

<sup>3</sup> Forcellini, s.v.

<sup>4</sup> Avell., p. 458, 22.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Caes.* lxi. 2; Juv. ii. 142.

<sup>6</sup> Ov. *Fast.* ii. 445 f.



It is not stated whether the flagellation was now entirely a thing of the past or only modified. The balanced phrases *nobiles currebant matronae vapulabant* may indicate that the women of rank, like men of similar station, no longer took part in the ritual, but left it to the lower class.

The evidence, then, as to the Lupercalia at this late date shows that it was a performance of the superstitious Christian mob. They thought of it as a purificatory rite by which evils might be averted from the state, its benefits even extending to outlying portions of Italy. The demon to be propitiated was of half-animal form, deriving its name *Februarius* from the month of purification. But, though the rites retained the name of "Lupercalia," they were considerably altered. Nude runners, not the ancient and honored Luperci, ran to and fro, singing sportive verses in which conspicuous scandals might be aired for the amusement of the people and the humiliation of the offender. As to the other practices of the day we have no complete evidence, and may suspect that they had suffered radical modification at the hands of the several Christian generations through which they had passed.

Some of the nobles shared the popular superstition, and wished to gratify the popular taste, though they had no inclination to humiliate themselves by becoming the performers in the entertainment.

The Pope was himself not entirely free from the superstition, but was none the less firm in his determination to stamp out the last remnants of demon-worship. That worship appeared in a typically indecent form, such as aroused the ire of the Christian moralists from St. Paul to St. Augustine. It now fell to the lot of Pope Gelasius to complete the work of Christian teachers and lawmakers, and declare that no one baptized, no Christian, should be defiled by the pagan rites.

# THE SPARTAN GYMNOPAIDIA

By BENJAMIN D. MERITT

THERE have appeared recently two studies which deal with problems of the Athenian calendar at the time of the renewal of the alliance between Athens and Argos in 417/6 B.C. A short paper by Geerlings dates the formal decree of alliance in the summer of 417, and a somewhat longer paper by Kolbe argues that the ratification of the alliance can have been effected only in the spring of 416.<sup>1</sup> Both authors have taken exception to my reconstruction of the

TABLE I

Date of Attic Year	Julian Interca-lation	Senatorial Year	Civil Year	Attic Interca-lation	Correspondences between the Julian, Senatorial, and Civil Calendars
419/8.....	O	365	384	I	July 5—Pryt. I, 1—Hek. 16
418/7.....	I	366	355	O	July 5—Pryt. I, 1—Skir. 27 (419/8)
417/6.....	O	365	384	I	July 5—Pryt. I, 1—Hek. 8
416/5.....	O	365	384	I	July 5—Pryt. I, 1—Skir. 18 (417/6)

Athenian civil calendar, justifiably, I believe, in that it indicates three successive intercalary years in the interval from 419/8 to 417/6.<sup>2</sup> These three years were indicated in my tables as years of thirteen months largely for the sake of building up a sequence from 419 to 415 B.C. Our evidence for the civil calendar in this period shows that in 419 the first day of Hekatombaion fell at the time of the new moon just before the summer solstice, and that in 415 the first day of Hekatombaion fell at the time of the second new moon after the summer solstice.<sup>3</sup> The necessary consequence of these time relationships is that three of the four civil years 419/8—416/5 must have been intercalary, and the arrangement given in my tables represents only one of the possible combinations of intercalary and ordinary years in

<sup>1</sup> Geerlings, "The Athenian Calendar and the Argive Alliance," *CP*, XXIV (1929), 239-44; Kolbe, "Das athenisch-argivische Bündnis von 416 v. Chr. G.," *ibid.*, XXV (1930), 105-16.

<sup>2</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, p. 118.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94, 121, and table, p. 118; "The Departure of Alcibiades for Sicily," *AJA*, XXXIV (1930), 125-52.

this sequence. The arrangement suggested by Geerlings is preferable in that it avoids the succession of three intercalary years. I now adopt Geerlings' scheme as correct and restate my tables of correspondences between the senatorial and civil years and the Julian calendar as shown in Table I.<sup>1</sup>

The acceptance of this sequence of years in the Athenian civil calendar does not in any way change the relative dates for the beginning of senatorial and civil years subsequent to 416/5, where it will be found that the first day of Hekatombaion occasionally fell at the second new moon following the summer solstice (415/4, 413/2, 412/1). In my first study of the calendar I argued for this late date for the beginning of the civil year in 415/4 because we know that a payment for the Panathenaic festival was made in this year on the twentieth day of the second prytany (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, ll. 56-58).<sup>2</sup> I have since been able to bring a second proof for the late date of Hekatombaion 1 in 415/4 by studying the sequence of events which followed during this summer in Athens after the mutilation of the herms.<sup>3</sup> The evidence of *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 328, that in the year of its date the seventh and twenty-fifth days of Gamelion fell in the seventh prytany is ample proof that Hekatombaion 1 of 413/2 fell at the second new moon after the solstice.<sup>4</sup>

Kolbe wishes to deny the possibility of giving to Hekatombaion so late a date. He writes: "Das würde bedeuten, dass das Jahr erst nach dem zweiten auf dem Sommersolstiz folgenden Neumond begonnen hat, was ich im Zeitalter Metons für ausgeschlossen halte."<sup>5</sup> Such an objection can be entertained, however, only at the expense of rejecting the evidence at our disposal with which we must reckon in forming a judgment. As a matter of methodology I hold that an a priori assumption as to what might be expected in Meton's day must give way to epigraphical evidence as to what actually transpired. I can only call attention again to this evidence (especially *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 328)

<sup>1</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, pp. 118-20; Geerlings, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

<sup>2</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>3</sup> Meritt, "The Departure of Alcibiades for Sicily," *loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, p. 93.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

and reiterate that Hekatombaion 1 did on occasion fall at the second new moon after the solstice.<sup>1</sup>

The sequence of years which Geerlings has proposed for the interval 419/8—416/5 finds its justification in the avoidance of three intercalary years in succession in the Athenian civil calendar. Geerlings, however, sought to bring a further support to his calendar scheme by showing that the alliance with Argos (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96) must be dated in the summer of 417. That the alliance was made in the summer of 417, so Geerlings argued, might be deduced from Thucydides.<sup>2</sup> We learn from the document of the alliance itself that Aiantis was the prytanizing tribe when the pact was ratified and that Euphemus was archon. But we also learn from *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, lines 28–29, that Aiantis held the eighth or ninth prytany of the year when Euphemus was archon, in the spring of 416. Since Aiantis cannot have held the prytany twice in the same year, it would follow that the tribe Aiantis which held the prytany when the alliance was ratified must have been the last tribe of the senatorial year 418/7, and that some part of this prytany must have lasted into the civil year 417/6 when Euphemus was archon. In this way we should find a short space of time when the senatorial year 418/7 had not come to its close and when the civil year 417/6 had already begun during which we might expect a decree (such as *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96) dated both by the tribe in prytany of the old year and by the archon of the new year. If we so interpret Thucydides<sup>3</sup> as to conclude that the alliance was renewed in the summer of 417,<sup>4</sup> then such a date for *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, the instrument of the alliance, is necessary. That it is also chronologically possible is shown by the equation taken from Geerlings' calendar scheme:

$$417/6 \text{ Pryt. I, 1} = \text{Hekatombaion 8}$$

Any date from Hekatombaion 1 to 7 would fall in the archonship of Euphemus but during the old senatorial year 418/7.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Fotheringham's review of Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, in *CR*, 1929, pp. 20–21. That Kolbe also realized the value of *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 328, as proof in this connection is shown by his review of *The Athenian Calendar* in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1929, pp. 1062–63.

<sup>2</sup> v. 82.

<sup>3</sup> v. 82 ff.

<sup>4</sup> This is the interpretation of Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 1265; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, IV, 493; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, II, I<sup>3</sup>, 352; Hiller (cf. note below *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, in the *Corpus*).

At this point Kolbe's contribution makes itself felt. He has quite correctly called our attention to the fact that Thucydides does not give evidence for the consummation of this alliance. Thucydides merely recounts the story of the democratic revolution in Argos in the summer of 417<sup>1</sup> and tells us that the Argives sought to renew the alliance with Athens. We must agree with Kolbe that the formal act of ratification may have been delayed until the following spring, in which case the prytany of Aiantis mentioned in *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, is to be identified with the prytany of Aiantis mentioned in *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, lines 28-29. The alliance was ratified, therefore, in the spring of 416 rather than in the summer of 417. Kolbe has given us a careful analysis of that part of Thucydides which bears upon this problem, and has established with a high degree of probability the correctness of his own interpretation as against the traditional view upon which Geerlings based his discussion. But the decision has not been left merely to a matter of interpretation of Thucydides. Kolbe has adduced other arguments to show that the alliance cannot have been ratified in the early days of Hekatombaion, as would be the necessary assumption if the traditional interpretation were correct. These additional arguments are three in number:

1. In view of the accuracy with which the Athenians were wont to date their documents (cf. *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 295) it is out of the quest on that they should have dated *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, as under the archonship of Euphemus provided it was really passed, as Geerlings claimed, in the prytany of Aiantis of 418/7, for the greater part of which senatorial year Antiphon was archon.<sup>2</sup>

2. Aristotle<sup>3</sup> tells us that the first of the four regular meetings of the assembly in each prytany was called *κῠρία*,<sup>4</sup> and during the fourth century we find that this meeting in the first prytany falls usually on the eleventh day of Hekatombaion. We cannot assume, then, that a meeting of the assembly took place during the first seven days of Hekatombaion in 417, as would be necessary if Geerlings' date for *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, were correct.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> v. 82.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 43.

<sup>4</sup> Kolbe writes: "Aus Aristoteles wissen wir, dass vier Ekklesien in jeder Prytanie die Regel waren und dass die erste als *κῠρία* bezeichnet wurde (*Ath. Pol.* 43)."

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 108.

3. The democratic revolution at Argos came at the time of the Spartan gymnopaidia, which must be dated in the month Karneios at Sparta, corresponding to the Attic Hekatombaion, Metageitnion, or Boedromion.<sup>1</sup> Geerlings' scheme necessitates the assumption that in 417 the gymnopaidia fell in Skirophorion. Since this is impossible, the date assigned by Geerlings to IG, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, cannot be correct.<sup>2</sup>

The third argument mentioned here deserves our closest attention, for if Kolbe is right in assigning the gymnopaidia of 417 to a date later than the Attic Skirophorion, then the Argive alliance cannot have been ratified in the senatorial year 418/7, and he has established his case that the ratification took place during the prytany of Aiantis in the spring of 416. I believe that Kolbe is justified in attributing the festival of the gymnopaidia to the Spartan month Karneios and in equating this month with one of the first three months of the Attic year. But in view of the serious difference of opinion among competent scholars on this question it will be well to examine more closely the date of the Karneian festival and of the gymnopaidia, especially in 417. To this problem we shall turn our attention shortly.

The first and second arguments outlined above are demonstrably fallacious, and cannot be used in any way to support Kolbe's thesis as to the date of the Argive alliance. I should pass them by with only brief notice if it were not for the fact that their fallacies, left uncorrected, might find their way into the interpretation of other epigraphical records of the fifth century.

Aristotle<sup>3</sup> does not say that the first of the four regular meetings of the assembly in each prytany was the ἐκκλησία κυρία. He tells us that one of the four was designated as κυρία, and I may mention merely by way of example that this particular assembly fell upon the thirty-second day of the ninth prytany in 330/29 (IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 352) and upon the twenty-sixth day of the fourth prytany in 327/6 (IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 356). But in spite of this we might even agree for purposes of argument that during the fourth century the first meeting of the assembly

<sup>1</sup> Kolbe writes: "Bei dem Schwanken des athenischen und spartanischen Kalenders ist es daher wohl denkbar, dass der Karneios (die Gymnopaïdien) dem Hekatombaion, Metageitnion, und Pyanopsion entsprach, aber der Skirophorion scheidet das." Pyanopsion here must be a slip of the pen for Boedromion, for Kolbe is evidently thinking of the first three months of the Attic year.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

came regularly on Prytany I, 11. This day corresponds to Hekatombaion 11, and we conclude that no meeting of the assembly would be probable on any day of Hekatombaion earlier than the eleventh. The possibility of the extraordinary session, the ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος, need not concern us here. Having determined the custom of the fourth century, Kolbe continues: "Nun ist es kaum glaubhaft, dass die Praxis des 5. Jahrhunderts in dieser Hinsicht eine andere gewesen ist."<sup>1</sup> The second fallacy of the argument lies here, as will be apparent upon a moment's reflection. It is not only credible that the usage of the fifth century was different; we know that it was different and we are in possession of the evidence as to how it was different. In the fourth century the senatorial and civil years had long been equated and Prytany I, 1 regularly coincided with Hekatombaion 1. Naturally, in the fourth century the first assembly of the first prytany, which came on the eleventh day, could only fall on Hekatombaion 11 as well. This correspondence has no validity for the fifth century when the senatorial year was not coterminous with the civil year. To state a hypothetical case, we may suppose that Prytany I, 1 fell on Skir. 24 in some year the date of which we need not define. Then Prytany I, 11 would fall on Hekatombaion 4 and so within the first week of Hekatombaion. Geerlings assumed that in 417 Prytany I, 1 fell on Hekatombaion 8. Any assembly held during the last seven days of the preceding senatorial year would thus fall during the first seven days of Hekatombaion. In this case, of course, the meeting would not be the first, but one of the later meetings of the prytany. Kolbe's assertion that a meeting of the assembly would not fall in the early days of Hekatombaion has no validity without the coincidence of the senatorial and civil years in the Athenian calendar. We know that this coincidence existed in the fourth century and that it did not exist in 417 B.C.

We come now to Kolbe's first objection, namely, that a decree passed during the interval of time toward the end of a senatorial year and after the beginning of the new civil year should not be dated by the prytany of the old year and the archon of the new. Such a system of dating, Kolbe argues, would make uncertain all our dates given in terms of the senatorial calendar, if the number of the prytany were

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 108.



not given along with its name. This uncertainty would apply to all decrees of the fifth century, for we should not know whether a decree belonged in the year of one archon or in that of his predecessor. I cannot concede the ambiguity which Kolbe claims for this system of dating. There might be ambiguity for us, to be sure, but we cannot expect that the Athenians would have foreseen and tried to avoid the difficulties which we have in determining the dates of their decrees. For example, much labor would have been saved to modern historians if only the Athenian scribe had given the archon's name in the preamble of the famous decree of Kallias (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 91). But the date of this decree was known to every Athenian, or was easily ascertainable. The decree was passed while Kekropis held the prytany and while Mnesitheos was secretary. These items are sufficient to fix the date within thirty-six or thirty-seven days, the length of the prytany. The decree was further dated by the name of the presiding officer, Eupheithes, and so the very day of its passage was known. It also carried the name of the orator Kallias, and in Athenian parlance the decree was probably designated as τὸ ψήφισμα δὲ Καλλίας εἶπε.

We may apply the same reasoning to the decree which embodies the Argive alliance (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96). It was passed during the prytany of Aiantis when—ὁδωρος was secretary. The Athenian citizen was in no doubt as to whether this tribe held the prytany in the summer of 417 or in the spring of 416. Today we have to use other evidence, collecting it from all available sources, to effect this determination; but the Athenian knew the secretary and knew the tribe for which he served and the date of his tenure of office. If it were true that this prytany was actually the last to hold office in the senatorial year 418/7, and that the decree was passed shortly after Euphemus had assumed the duties of archonship at the beginning of the new civil year, the additional item of date Εὐφρημος ἦρχε could have caused no confusion to an Athenian, merely because Aiantis again held the prytany in the spring of 416 with another secretary while Euphemus was still archon. He would have known not only the prytany but the day of the passage of this decree from the name of the presiding officer given in the preamble. Such ambiguity as there is exists in our minds because of our lack of knowledge of Athenian secretaries and presiding officers. It

was the secretary, not the archon, whose name was important in fixing the dates of Attic decrees in the fifth century.

There were several years during the fifth century at Athens when the new civil year began before the expiration of the old senatorial year,<sup>1</sup> and we may well ask ourselves how a decree passed by the assembly at such a time would be dated. The regular formula calls for the name of the prytany, the name of the secretary of the senate, the name of the presiding officer, and the name of the orator. The name of the archon might also be given. Kolbe argues as follows: "Selbst wenn wir den Fall setzen, dass die Aiantis unter Euphemos' Vorgänger Antiphon die X. war, ferner, dass sie bis in die ersten Tage unter Euphemos hineinreichte, blieb sie technisch die 'Aiantis aus Antiphons Jahr.'"<sup>2</sup> If I interpret these lines correctly, Kolbe would have the name of the archon given as Antiphon if it were to be given at all. This of course would not be correct, for the premise assumes that Euphemus had already entered upon his archonship. I hold that if any mention at all is to be made of a date by archon, it should give us the name of Euphemus in conformity with the fact. Kolbe's argument that the mention of Euphemus would be ambiguous we have already discounted. He continues: "Das halte ich im Hinblick auf die Genauigkeit, mit der die Athener bei der Datierung vorzugehen pflegten (vgl. z. B. I<sup>2</sup>, 295) für völlig ausgeschlossen." But accuracy in such a case would demand a date ἐπ' Εὐφήμου according to the premises of our argument, and not a date ἐπ' Ἀντιφώντος.

The very inscription which Kolbe cites in support of his case may be used as telling evidence against him, for we find in the Corcyra inscription (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 295) an example of the "ambiguity" the possibility of which Kolbe denies. The first payment to the generals was made while Apseudes was archon,<sup>3</sup> during the prytany of Aiantis of the Senate for which Kritiades was first secretary, and by the treasurers of Athena for whom Krates was secretary. Here we have a case parallel to the one under discussion, with the only difference that the overlapping of years manifests itself in the divergence of the Pana-

<sup>1</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Johnson, "A Note on the Corcyra Expedition," *AJA*, XXXIII (1929), 400.

thenaie interval from the civil and senatorial years rather than in the divergence of the civil year from the senatorial. The archon and Senate belong to the year 433/2, and the treasurers of Athena belong to the year 434/3. Technically, according to Kolbe, our treasurers of Athena should belong to the year of Krates; they are the "treasurers from Krates' year." But they appear here in this inscription under a date which bears the name of the archon Apseudes, because in fact the payment was made during the interval of time when they were still in office near the end of the Panathenaic year 434/3 and after Apseudes had assumed his duties as archon for the civil year 433/2. I argue from this analogy that when a decree is passed in the last days of a senatorial year and in the early days of the following civil year, dated both by prytany and archon, it will bear the date of the prytany of the old senatorial year and of the archon of the new civil year. This system of dating is accurate, and to an Athenian it could cause no ambiguity.

These general objections which Kolbe has raised against the date given by Geerlings to *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, are not necessary, however, to the establishment of his case. The reason for dating the Argive alliance in the spring of 416 is found in his interpretation of Thucydides<sup>1</sup> and in the close connection between the democratic revolt at Argos in 417 and the Spartan festival of the gymnopaidia. Kolbe has urged that the gymnopaidia be assigned to the early days of the month Karneios at Sparta.<sup>2</sup> In so doing he follows the interpretation of Unger and Farnell rather than that of Nilsson and Hiller.<sup>3</sup>

This identification of the date of the gymnopaidia rests primarily upon a quotation given in Bekker's *Anecdota*, I, 234: *γυμνοπαΐδια· ἐν Σπάρτῃ παῖδες γυμνοὶ παιᾶνας ᾄδοντες ἐχόρευον Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Καρνείῳ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πανήγυριν*. The festival in honor of Karneian Apollo was held, of course, in the month Karneios, which Plutarch tells us corresponded to the Attic Metageitnion. He uses these words in giving the date of the battle of the Asinarus in Sicily in the summer of 413: *ἡμέρα δ' ἦν τετράς φθίνοντος τοῦ Καρνείου μηνός, δν Ἀθηναῖοι Μεταγειτνιώνα προσαγορεύουσι*.<sup>4</sup> Plutarch is referring here to the month Kar-

<sup>1</sup> v. 82 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> Unger, *Philologus*, XLIII (1884), 641; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, IV, 260; Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, pp. 140-42; Hiller, s.v. in Pauly-Wissowa, *Handbuch*.

<sup>4</sup> *Plut. Nikias* 28.

neios in the Syracusan calendar, but since the festival was pan-Doric in its character we may conclude that in general the month Karneios in all Doric states corresponded to the Attic Metageitnion. There is further evidence in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (vi. 4. 16) that the battle of Leuctra was fought on the fifth of Hekatombaion according to the Athenian calendar and that the news of the Spartan defeat reached Sparta at the time of the gymnopaidia. In 371 B.C., therefore, the gymnopaidia was celebrated in the Attic Hekatombaion. Hiller uses this evidence to show that the gymnopaidia and the Karneia were distinct in point of time, and argues that an interval of at least five weeks elapsed between them. Both he and Nilsson are forced to assume that there was some confusion in the mind of the author of the scholium given in Bekker's *Anecdota*.

The correspondence given by Plutarch is not defined for any particular year, and for this reason it is all the more valuable to us in that it states a general and not a specific equation. If Plutarch had told us that in 413 B.C. the Syracusan Karneios corresponded to the Attic Metageitnion, we should have been able to draw no conclusion relative to calendar correspondences in other years. But Plutarch's statement is entirely general and has no significance for the actual calendar correspondences of 413. In fact, we know that the eclipse of August 27, 413, which fell in the Syracusan Karneios, must have taken place during the Attic Hekatombaion of this year.

Once we realize the general application of Plutarch's date for the month Karneios we may conclude that intercalations in the Athenian or Spartan calendars might bring it one month earlier (in Hekatombaion) or one month later (in Boedromion). There is, therefore, no valid reason for discounting the statement of the scholiast in Bekker's *Anecdota* that the gymnopaidia formed part of the celebration in honor of Karneian Apollo. We learn rather from the additional data of Xenophon that the Karneian festival of 371 fell in Hekatombaion, and that this month corresponded in this particular year to the Spartan Karneios.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hesychius (s.v.) and Pausanias (iii. 11. 9) inform us that the dances of the gymnopaidia were presented in the market place. Nilsson's argument (*op. cit.*, p. 141) that they should be associated with the worship of Pythian rather than Karneian Apollo, because Pausanias mentions a statue of Pythian Apollo in the market place at Sparta, seems to me to lack conviction. On the other hand, Unger's note (*op. cit.*, p. 642) with

In our present discussion we are concerned especially with the chronology of political disturbances at Argos, where it happens that we are fairly well informed. We learn from Thucydides<sup>1</sup> that the Athenians and their allies marched against Epidaurus in the summer of 418 while the Spartans were celebrating the Karneia. These maneuvers came at the very end of summer, and the narrative of Thucydides compels us to date the Karneia in the lunar period which began with the new moon of September 8.<sup>2</sup> This same lunar cycle corresponded to the Attic month of Boedromion, and we conclude that in 418 B.C. the Spartan month was equated with Attic Boedromion.

It is to be noticed also that part of the force which invested Epidaurus consisted of recent reinforcements of one thousand men from Athens. In all probability these are the men who went to Argos with Demosthenes in the second prytany of the senatorial year 418/7 (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, ll. 10-14).<sup>3</sup> We know that the date of the payment made for this expedition fell in the latter half of the prytany<sup>4</sup> and consequently somewhere near the first of September. The troops arrived at Argos and were in the field against Epidaurus<sup>5</sup> a week or two later, when the Spartans were holding their Karneian festival. There is this added indication that in 418 the Spartan Karneios corresponded to the Attic Boedromion.

In the following year Karneios must again have coincided with the Attic Boedromion. There is little likelihood that 418/7 was a year of thirteen months in the Spartan calendar, for already the Karneian festival was falling at its latest possible date. The insertion of an intercalated month in 418/7 would bring the Karneian festival into October of 417. The calendar scheme which Geerlings has advocated at Athens during these years indicates also that 418/7 was a year of twelve

---

reference to the entertainment of foreigners in Sparta at the time of the gymnopaedia (*Xen. Memorabilia* i. 2. 61) gives some indication that it formed part of the same celebration with the Karneia.

<sup>1</sup> v. 75.

<sup>2</sup> The dates of new moon here given are for Mean New Moon, reckoned on the basis of the tables in Guinness, *Creation Centred in Christ*, Vol. II.

<sup>3</sup> West and McCarthy, "A Revision of *I.G.* I<sup>2</sup>, 302," *AJA*, XXXII (1928), 352.

<sup>4</sup> Meritt, "The Departure of Alcibiades for Sicily," *ibid.*, XXXIV (1930), Plates I and II, l. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Thuc. v. 75.

months in the Athenian calendar. We may conclude, then, that the festival of the Karneia fell in the Attic month Boedromion both in 418 and in 417. It remains to determine, independently of the scholium in Bekker's *Anecdota*, the date of the gymnopaidia in 417.

The solution of this problem is made possible by the statement of Diodorus that the oligarchy which was in power in Argos in 417 maintained itself for eight months: διακατασχόντες δὲ ταύτην τὴν πολιτείαν μῆνας ὀκτῶ κατέλιθσαν, τοῦ δήμου συστάντος ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.<sup>1</sup> Thucydides gives the date of the establishment of this oligarchy as near the end of the winter of 418/7: καὶ πρὸς ἔαρ ἦδη ταῦτα ἦν τοῦ χειμῶνος λήγοντος.<sup>2</sup> This can hardly have been earlier than February of 417, which corresponds in this year to the Attic Anthesterion. Now, we learn also from Thucydides that the oligarchy was overthrown at the time of the Spartan gymnopaidia: ὁ δῆμος . . . ἐπέθεντο τοῖς ὀλίγοις, τηρήσαντες αὐτὰς τὰς γυμνοπαιδίας τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.<sup>3</sup> When we reckon inclusively from Anthesterion we find that the eight months of Diodorus bring us to Boedromion in the summer of 417. We have already discovered that this was the equivalent of the Spartan Karneios; we now find that it was the month of the gymnopaidia as well. In other words, the festival of the gymnopaidia was closely associated with the Karneian festival, just as stated by the scholiast in Bekker's *Anecdota*, and we must assume that it fell in the early days of the month,<sup>4</sup> shortly before the Karneian festival proper.

Our epigraphical and literary traditions are thus brought into harmony. There is no need to assume with Unger<sup>5</sup> that the eight months of Diodorus rest upon a confusion of the oligarchical revolutions in Argos and Sicyon,<sup>6</sup> or to discredit the evidence of our scholiast that the gymnopaidia belonged to the celebration in honor of Karneian Apollo.

We must agree with Kolbe that the late date of the gymnopaidia and the consequent late date of the democratic revolution in Argos in the summer of 417 preclude the possibility of dating IG, I<sup>2</sup>, 96, in the early days of Hekatombaion or in the last prytany of the senatorial year 418/7. The alliance between Athens and Argos must have

<sup>1</sup> xii. 80. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Xen. *Hell.* vi. 4. 16.

<sup>2</sup> v. 81.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 640.

<sup>3</sup> v. 82.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. v. 81.

been ratified when Aiantis held the eighth or ninth prytany in the spring of 416 (cf. *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, l. 28).

I mention here one further proof that the revolution at Argos came toward the end of summer, and not in Skirophorion, as was the necessary assumption with which Geerlings worked. Thucydides describes the building of the long walls from Argos to the sea, which the Argives undertook as soon as their democracy was established, with these words: *καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἀργεῖοι πανδημεί, καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ οἰκέται, ἐτείχιζον· καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν αὐτοῖς ἦλθον τέκτονες καὶ λιθουργοί. καὶ τὸ θέρος ἐτελεύτα.*<sup>1</sup> The implication here is that the building of the walls came near the end of the summer, and I believe that the next chapter of Thucydides shows this interpretation to be correct: *τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου χειμῶνος Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὥς ᾔσθοντο τειχιζόντων, ἐστράτευσαν ἐς τὸ Ἄργος.*<sup>2</sup> The reason for the Spartan expedition was their fear of a successful completion of the long walls from Argos to the sea. As soon as they heard that the walls were being built, in the beginning of the winter half of the year, they made their campaign against Argos and destroyed the walls, which were still in process of construction.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the Spartans did not learn of the work on the walls until the opening of the winter season shows that we are justified in dating the inception of this work and the democratic revolution which made it possible in the late summer of 417.

Although we must conclude that the date which Geerlings and I had attributed to the decree of alliance between Athens and Argos is no longer tenable, we need not reject the calendar scheme which Geerlings proposed for the years 419/8—416/5 as the result of his study. His scheme is sufficiently justified by the fact that it avoids three intercalary years in succession in the Athenian civil calendar. On the other hand, Kolbe's criticism of Geerlings' study finds its justification in the late date of the Spartan gymnopaedia, and is not, of course, invalidated by the fallacy of some of the arguments used to support his thesis. In our search for new facts of Athenian history in the fifth century we must all be grateful that Kolbe has kept us from giving an erroneous date to *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 96. We must also be grateful that his interpretation of Thucydides has now corrected the misapprehension of

<sup>1</sup> v. 82, 6.

<sup>2</sup> v. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. v. 83. 2.



long standing that the alliance between Athens and Argos was ratified in the summer of 417.

We should not close our discussion, however, without noting the consequences which this study has in the Spartan calendar. We have observed that in 418 and 417 the Spartan month Karneios corresponded to the Attic Boedromion; that is, it coincided with the lunar cycle commencing on September 8 in 418 and on August 27 in 417.

TABLE II

Calendar Year	Spartan Intercalation	Attic Intercalation	Karneios 1: Number of New Moon after Solstice	Karneios 1: Date of New Moon after Solstice
424/3. ....	(I) Karneios = Metageitnion	O	Second	Aug. 15
423/2. ....	O Karneios = Boedromion	O	Third	Sept. 3
422/1. ....	O Karneios = Boedromion	I	Second	Aug. 23
421/0. ....	(I) Karneios = Metageitnion	O	Second	Aug. 12
420/19. ....	(O) Karneios = Boedromion	O	Third	Aug. 31
419/8. ....	(I) Karneios = Boedromion	I	Second	Aug. 20
418/7. ....	(O) Karneios = Boedromion	O	Third	Sept. 8
417/6. ....	(O) Karneios = Boedromion	I	Third	Aug. 27
416/5. ....	(I) Karneios = Metageitnion	I	Second	Aug. 17
415/4. ....	(O) Karneios = Metageitnion	O	Third	Sept. 5
414/3. ....	(O) Karneios = Metageitnion	I	Second	Aug. 25
413/2. ....	(I) Karneios = Hekatombaion	O	Second	Aug. 13

We know from Plutarch<sup>1</sup> that the month Karneios at Syracuse in 413 contained the lunar eclipse of August 27. This month may with great probability be equated with the Spartan Karneios, which began consequently at the new moon of August 13 in this year. It follows that only one of the five years in Sparta from 418/7 to 414/3 can have been an intercalary year, and in order to avoid three ordinary years in succession we must assume that this year of thirteen months fell in 416/5.

It is known also that 423/2 and 422/1 were ordinary years in the Spartan calendar.<sup>2</sup> These facts allow us to build up a sequence of ordinary and intercalary years, avoiding three ordinary years in succession, only according to one unique scheme. It will be instructive to arrange these dates in tabular form (see Table II) together with the sequence of years covering the same period in the Athenian calendar.

We have learned to be cautious about building up a calendar scheme by means of cycles of intercalation. I propose this arrangement of the Spartan calendar merely on the basis of evidence now at

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, pp. 101-2.

our disposal. There may have been irregularities which we do not now suspect, just as there were irregularities in the Athenian calendar during the same period. It will be observed that in the majority of cases the Spartan Karneios began at the second new moon after the summer solstice—a fact which is in itself sufficient justification for Plutarch's general statement that Karneios was the month called by the Athenians Metageitnion.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S USE OF JOSEPHUS

With the exception of Plato no other writer of Greek prose is quoted more often by St. Chrysostom (ca. 347–407) than Josephus (37–ca. 101), to whose works, the *Bellum Iudaicum* and the *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, he has frequent recourse.

In his treatise *Adversus oppugnatores eorum qui ad monasticam vitam inducunt* St. Chrysostom compares those who actively oppose the professors of the monastic life with the Jews who hindered the apostles when they began to preach the gospel. As a consequent of this persecution of the early Christians, St. Chrysostom holds that calamities befell the Jews and cites as prophetic the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. 24:21. For illustration St. Chrysostom quotes one of the famous passages from Josephus describing the horrors of the famine in Jerusalem during its siege by Titus in 70. The quotation is from the *Bellum Iudaicum* vi. 192–214 and occurs in the edition of St. Chrysostom's treatise printed by Migne in *Patrologia Graeca*, XLVII, 325–27. Josephus is not mentioned by name here, St. Chrysostom merely giving the source as follows: 'Ερῶ δὲ οὐκ ἐμὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς Ἰουδαίου τοῦ τὰ ἐκείνων [i.e., Ἰουδαίων] ἱστορηκότος ἀκριβῶς. The fidelity of the transcription is very high, for the citation corresponds quite closely with the text of Josephus presented by Niese. There are no important *variae lectiones*, but, as often in patristic writers, the editors have omitted the *vñ ἐφελεκυστικόν* wherever possible.

St. Chrysostom again quotes from this passage in the homily *De perfecta caritate*. He prefaces the quotation with the mention of τὴν Ἰωσήφον βίβλον, ἣν ἔγραψε περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἀλώσεως (PG, LVI, 289). His method in this instance is complex: He uses the short section of the *Bellum Iudaicum* vi. 197 (which is a sentence of thirty-four words) by rendering the thought of the last clause in his own words (retaining some of Josephus', however) and by quoting the *ipsissima verba* of the first part of the first clause, to which he adds καθὼς ποὺ φησιν ὁ προλεχθεὶς συγγραφεύς.

The horrors of famine and its consequent pestilence, as has been seen, make a deep impression upon St. Chrysostom, who again refers to Josephus for a description of their work. In the seventy-fifth homily of his *Commentarius in S. Matthaeum* we read:

Καὶ εἰ βούλει σαφέστερον ταῦτα μαθεῖν, τοὺς λιμοὺς λέγω, τοὺς λοιμοὺς, τοὺς σεισμοὺς, τὰς ἄλλας τραγῳδίας, τὴν ἱστορίαν τὴν περὶ τούτων Ἰωσήφῳ συγκειμένην ἔπελθε, καὶ πάντα εἴση μετὰ ἀκριβείας [PG, LVIII, 690].

Besides his account in the *Bellum Iudaicum* vi. 193–219 from which St. Chrysostom has twice quoted, Josephus describes the famine earlier in the same work (v. 424–38, 571).

A fourth reference to Josephus' description of the siege appears in the *Opus imperfectum in S. Matthaeum*, the most important spurious work attributed to St. Chrysostom. This collection of homilies exists only in Latin, and the allusion to Josephus is as follows: "Quales pestilentiae, et qualis fames, et terrae motus praecesserunt Iudaeam, antequam Jerusalem caperetur, cognoscere potest qui Josephum legit" (PG, LVI, 904). Passing notice of the *Bellum Iudaicum* is also made in this work: "Sed postquam ingressus est exercitus Iudaeam, sicut exponit Josephus, non statim ad Jerusalem applicavit, sed ad civitates singulas regionis illius, et diversa prius gesta sunt bella, et plurimae civitates captae, et sic novissime Jerusalem obsedit exercitus" (902).

In the sixty-fifth homily of his *Commentarius in S. Joannem* St. Chrysostom comments on the prophetic words of Jesus foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem (ἰδοὺ, ἀφίεται ὑμῶν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος—Matt. 23:38), and in support adduces evidence from Josephus, who records various portents during the siege of Jerusalem which are predictive of its final destruction:

Καὶ Ἰώσηπος δὲ μετὰ βραχὺν γενόμενος χρόνον, ἔφη τινὰς ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἐτι παραμένοντας, εἰ μὴ βουλευθεῖεν ἐκεῖνοι μεταστῆναι, καταλιπεῖν αὐτοῖς [PG, LIX, 361].

This reference seems to be the voice heard in the Temple at the feast of Pentecost in 70 proclaiming μεταβαίνομεν ἐντεῦθεν (*Bellum Iudaicum* vi. 299).<sup>1</sup>

St. Chrysostom again refers to Josephus' account of the prodigies preceding the fall of Jerusalem, when in the fifth homily of his *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum* he expounds Acts 2:19–20:

Καὶ δώσω, φησί, τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω. Ταῦτα καὶ περὶ τῆς μελλούσης κρίσεως καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τῆς ἀλώσεως λέγων αἰνίττεται. Αἷμα καὶ πῦρ, καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. Ὅρα, πῶς τὴν ἀλωσιν ὑπέγραψεν. Ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφῆσεται εἰς σκότος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα. Ἀπὸ τῆς διαθέσεως τῶν πασχόντων τοῦτο εἰρηκε. Λέγεται δ' οὖν ὁμοῦ καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα γεγενῆσθαι ἐν οὐρανῷ, καθὼς Ἰώσηπος μαρτυρεῖ [PG, LX, 50–51].

Josephus describes in detail the several omens which occurred before and during the war and the siege in his *Bellum Iudaicum* vi. 285–315.

In his exegesis on Matt. 24:21 St. Chrysostom refers in the seventy-sixth homily of his *Commentarius in S. Matthaeum* to the sufferings of the Jews in the time of Vespasian and calls upon the testimony of Josephus (PG, LVIII, 694–95). He says:

Καὶ μὴ τις νομίῃ τοῦτο ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρησθαι· ἀλλ' ἐντυχὼν τοῖς Ἰωσήπου γράμμασι, μαθησάμενος τῶν ἐρημένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο ἂν ἔχοι τίς εἰπεῖν, ὅτι πιστὸς ὢν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸ συστήσαι τὰ ἐρημένα ἐξώγκωσε τὴν τραγῳδίαν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἰουδαῖος ἦν,

<sup>1</sup> There is no MS witness for μεταβαίνομεν, which Zonaras and Eusebius read. Tacitus supports the text of Josephus by writing "exapertae repente delubri fores, et audita maior humana vox, excedere deos; simul ingens motus excedentium" (*Historiae* v. 13).

καὶ σφόδρα Ἰουδαίους, καὶ ζηλωτῆς, καὶ τῶν μετὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν. Τί οὖν οὗτος φησιν; Ὅτι πᾶσαν ἐνίκησε τραγωδίαν ἐκεῖνα τὰ δεινὰ, καὶ πόλεμος οὐδὲς οὐδέποτε τοιοῦτος τὸ ἔθνος κατέλαβε. Τσοῦτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ λιμός, ὡς αὐταῖς ταῖς μητρᾷσι περιμάχοντων εἶναι τὴν παιδοφαγίαν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου πολέμους γίνεσθαι<sup>1</sup> πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ νεκροὺς γενομένους κατὰ μέσας ἀναρρήγνυσθαι τὰς γαστέρας ἔφη.

But St. Chrysostom is wrong in ascribing to the *Bellum Iudaicum* the story of mothers fighting about the eating of their children. This incident comes from the *Antiquitates Iudaicae* ix. 62-66, where Josephus speaks of the siege of Samaria in the time of Elisha. The source of this story is found in IV Kings 6:25-29.

In a homily entitled *In secundum adventum Christi* and ascribed to St. Chrysostom (falsely in the opinion of his editors), mention is made of the history of Josephus in which he describes the Jewish war. The author writes thus:

Ἀνάγκωθι τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ Ἰωσήπου, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀναπνεῦσαι δυνήσῃ ἀκούων, ἅπερ ἔπαθον ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκεῖνοι. Φησὶ γάρ, ὅτι πᾶσαν ἐνίκησε τραγωδίαν ἐκεῖνα τὰ δεινὰ, καὶ ὅτι πόλεμος οὐδὲς οὐδέποτε τοιοῦτος ἔθνος κατέλαβε [PG, LIX, 623].

It will be noticed that the words πᾶσαν . . . κατέλαβε (also found in the preceding quotation) are given as a true citation from Josephus. Rather it appears that they convey in paraphrase the thought of the beginning of the *Bellum Iudaicum*, where we read:

. . . τὸν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον συστάντα μέγιστον οὐ μόνον τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἀκοφὴ παρελήφαμεν ἢ πόλεων πρὸς πόλεις ἢ ἔθνων ἔθνεσι συρραγέντων [i. 1] and τὰ γούιν πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα πρὸς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἡττηθῆναι δοκῶ κατὰ συγκρίσιν [i. 12].<sup>1</sup>

The author of the seventh of the sermons *In sanctum Pascha*, wrongly ascribed to St. Chrysostom, appeals to Josephus about the proper time for celebrating the Passover in these words:

Ἐρχομεν μάρτυρας σοφοὺς Ἑβραίους, οἷον Φίλωνα, καὶ Ἰώσηπον [sic], καὶ ἄλλους τινάς, οἵτινες ἐν τοῖς οικείοις συγγράμμασι διαβεβαιοῦνται, ὅτι οὐ δύναται ἀκριβῶς ἄλλως τὸ πάσχα γενέσθαι, ἢ μετ' ἑαρινὴν ἰσημερινὰν ἐκσταῶσαν. Καὶ ὀρίζονται οὗτοι ἀνέκαθεν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰρμόν τετηρηθῆναι μετὰ τῆς κατὰ σελήνην τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης, ὡς πολλάκις ἐβρέθη. Οὗτοι δὲ σαφῶς, ὡς πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπίστανται, μετὰ τὸ Πάθος τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐγένοντο, πολλῶ τῷ μετέπειτα χρόνῳ βιώσαντες<sup>2</sup> ὥστε δῆλον εἶναι, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔπαθε μετ' ἰσημερινὰν [PG, LIX, 748].

The pertinent passages are in Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae* ii. 311-13; iii. 248, which support the claim of the writer of the sermon.

In the fifth of his *Orationes adversus Iudaeos*, St. Chrysostom interprets a vision of Daniel and takes occasion to quote Josephus (PG, XLVIII, 896-99). The citation is lengthy and is taken from the *Antiquitates Iudaicae* x. 269-77, which St. Chrysostom breaks into three parts (269-76, 276, 277) by interpos-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also i. 27-29. It is interesting to compare this statement with the belief of Thucydides about the Peloponnesian War (*Historiae* i. 1) and the opinion of Livy about the Hannibalic War (*Ab urbe condita* xxi. i. 1-3).

ing his own comments. He pays high tribute to Josephus in his preface to the quotation:

Καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα οὐ στοχαζόμενος λέγω, φέρε καὶ ἕτερον τῶν εἰρημένων παραγάγωμεν μάρτυρα, ὃν μάλιστα ἀξιόπιστον εἶναι νομίζουσιν, Ἰώσηπον [sic] λέγω, τὸν καὶ τὰς συμφορὰς αὐτῶν τραγώδησαντα, καὶ τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην παραφράσαντα πᾶσαν· δε μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν γενόμενος, καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προῤῥηθεῖσαν εἰπὼν, καὶ περὶ ταύτης διελέχθη τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς γενομένης, τὴν τοῦ προφήτου ἐρμηνεύων ὄρασιν, τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ κριοῦ καὶ τοῦ τράγου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων κεράτων, καὶ τοῦ ὀστέρου τοῦ μετ' ἐκείνα ἀνελθόντος.

As in the first quotation from Josephus, so here St. Chrysostom's reproduction scarcely differs from the text of Josephus.

St. Chrysostom devotes part of the fourteenth homily in his *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum* to an exegesis of the speech of Gamaliel reported by St. Luke in Acts 5:34-39. Gamaliel mentions the insurrections headed by Theudas (36) and Judas (37), and St. Chrysostom refers his readers to Josephus for their history in these words:

Ταῦτα τοῖς τοῦ Ἰωσήπου βιβλίοις ἐγκύβαντες μαθήσεσθε ἀκριβέστερον· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τὴν τούτων ἱστορίαν συντάττων ἀκριβῶς ἱστορεῖ [PG, LX, 114].

Now the only Theudas mentioned by Josephus (*Antiquitates Iudaicae* xx. 97-99) flourished when Cuspius Fadus was procurator of Judea from 44 to 46, at least seven years after the date of Gamaliel's speech. This chronological discrepancy has provoked various solutions, which may be examined in all the important commentaries on Acts, in dictionaries and encyclopedias *s.v.* "Theudas," and in special treatises on the dependence of Luke upon Josephus. The point here is merely that St. Chrysostom appeals to Josephus for the story of Theudas and that the only account of Theudas given by Josephus does not coincide chronologically with what we know of him through Luke. The revolt of Judas occurred when P. Sulpicius Quirinius was legate of Syria from 6 to 9, and is mentioned by Josephus in *Antiquitates Iudaicae* xviii. 1-10, 23-25; xx. 102 and in *Bellum Iudaicum* ii. 118, 433; vii. 253.

St. Chrysostom devotes half of the ninth homily in his *Commentarius in S. Matthaeum* to the slaughter of the innocents at Bethlehem. In touching upon the end of Herod the Great he refers the reader to Josephus for the well-known details, ἅπερ εἴσεσθε τὴν Ἰωσήπου περὶ τούτων ἱστορίαν ἐπελθόντες (PG, LVII, 179). In the *Bellum Iudaicum* Josephus has much to say about Herod, whose history fills the greater part of the last two-thirds of the first book. His miserable death and last illness are described in §§ 656-65.

St. Chrysostom errs in asserting that the war in 37 between Aretas (the king of Arabia Petraea) and Herod Antipas (the tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea) arose from the execution of John the Baptist and in ascribing the ultimate destruction of Jerusalem to the same cause. In speaking of John the Baptist in the thirteenth homily of his *Commentarius in S. Joannem*, St. Chrysostom gives Josephus as his authority for this statement:

Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Ἰώσηπος τῇ τούτου [i.e., Ἰωάννου] τελευτῇ τὸν πόλεμον λογίζεται, δι' αὐτὸν τε δέικνυσιν μὴδὲ πόλιν εἶναι τὴν ποτε μητρόπολιν οὖσαν, καὶ μακροῦς συνείρει περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγους ἐγκωμίων [PG, LIX, 87].

Now Josephus ascribes the war to Herod's repudiation of his wife, who was the daughter of Aretas, and relates that Herod's army was totally destroyed by the forces of Aretas (*Antiquitates Iudaicae* xviii. 109-15), and declares twice that some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God as a punishment for Herod's execution of John the Baptist (*ibid.* 116-19). Josephus nowhere hints that John's death can be taken as a reason for the fall of Jerusalem more than a generation afterward.

In the twenty-seventh homily of his *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum* St. Chrysostom writes of the death of Herod Agrippa I, which fell in 44, and cites Josephus:

Τούτο καὶ Ἰώσηπος λέγει, ὅτι μακρὰ περίεπεσε νόσῳ. . . . Ὁ δὲ Ἰώσηπος φησιν, ὅτι καὶ ἐσθῆτα λαμπρὰν ἐξ [sic] ἀργύρου πεποιημένην περίεκειτο [PG, LX, 206].

Josephus tells of the last illness and death of Herod in *Antiquitates Iudaicae* xix. 343-50. In *ὅτι* . . . περίεκειτο St. Chrysostom does not give literally the words of Josephus, which are *στολὴν ἐνδὺς ἐξ [sic] ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν* . . . *παρήλθεν* (344).

P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

#### ANTIGYMNASIARCH IN STRABO AND IN A LOCRIAN INSCRIPTION

Mark Antony, according to the current texts of Strabo,<sup>1</sup> *γυμνασιάρχίαν ὑποσχόμενος Ταρσεῦσι τούτων* (Boethus) *ἀντὶ γυμνασιάρχου κατέστησε, καὶ τὰ ἀναλώματα ἐπίστευσεν αὐτῷ*. This is read without deviation by Kramer, Meineke, and Jones in their respective editions.<sup>2</sup> Kramer's critical note is as follows: "*ἀντιγυμνασιάρχον* codd., exc. *sw*, ex quibus Tzsch[uckius] rec. *ἀντὶ γυμνασιάρχου*, quod quamvis et ipsum insolentius dictum sit, tamen unice verum videtur: haud facile enim dicatur, quid sit *ἀντιγυμνασιάρχος*."

It is easier now than in the time of Kramer to explain *quid sit ἀντιγυμνασιάρχος*. So long as the word would have been *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* if received in the text of Strabo, there may have been reason for regarding it with suspicion; but the publication in 1915<sup>3</sup> of a Locrian inscription reading *γυμνασιαρχοῦντος δὲ Τιμοκράτους τοῦ Νικάρχου, ἀντιγυμνασιαρχοῦντος Ζωΐλου* removes any doubts formerly entertained as to the possibility of such an official as an *ἀντιγυμνασιάρχος*.

Again, Kramer rightly attaches no particular value either to *s* (Parisinus 1408, of the late fifteenth century) or to *w* (Venetus 379, of the fifteenth century). On purely textual grounds, then, *ἀντιγυμνασιάρχον* would be the preferable reading, and it has the additional support of being the *lectio difficilior*.

<sup>1</sup> xiv. 5. 14 Casaubon (p. 674).

<sup>2</sup> Professor Jones, however, in a kind communication comes to my support in declaring for a return to the tradition of the manuscripts in this passage. I acknowledge the benefit which I have derived from his criticism of various points in the foregoing paper.

<sup>3</sup> By Oldfather in *Amer. Jour. Arch.*, XIX, 323 f., No. 10. The inscription was re-edited by Pappadakis in *Ἀρχ. Δελτ.* VI (1920-21), 139, and is now in *SEG*, III, 421.



Hence there seems to be every reason for, and no reason against, restoring in this Strabonian passage the reading found in all manuscripts except *s* and *w*.

The sense of the passage is not materially altered by the restored reading. Mark Antony had promised a gymnasiarchy to the people of Tarsus; this promise he only partially fulfilled, as an antigymnasiarchy was evidently a matter of less dignity and consequence. "To be deputy-gymnasiarch" is the sense assigned to ἀντιγυμνασιάρχῳ by the new edition of the *Greek-English Lexicon* of Liddell and Scott, and a deputy-gymnasiarch could hardly have been quite so satisfactory to the pride of the Tarsians. Oldfather<sup>1</sup> interprets the Locrian inscription to mean that Timocrates died or vacated his office before the natural term of his gymnasiarchy had expired; Zoilus succeeded him and filled out the remainder of the term. By this interpretation Zoilus was a successor or deputy. We may compare with the cases of Zoilus and Boethus that of Bulagoras in Samos, τοῦ γυμνασίου χειροτονηθεὶς κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἐπιστάτης ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου διὰ τὸ ἐγλιπεῖν τὸν γυμνασιάρχουντα,<sup>2</sup> but Bulagoras did not actually receive in the inscription the title of antigymnasiarch.

The rank and the function of an antigymnasiarch may have been that either of a substitute or an assistant. Although the prefix ἀντι- strongly favors the former alternative, it is indubitable that it sometimes bears the latter sense. In the Athenian ephebic college we find the κοσμητής and ἀντικοσμητής constantly functioning side by side, with no question of the latter's substituting for the former.<sup>3</sup> If we style the κοσμητής the president of the ephebic college, the ἀντικοσμητής would be the vice-president; and the latter is named so regularly in the ephebic inscriptions of the Empire that he can hardly have been a mere figurehead. The ὑποκοσμητής, under-kosmetes or assistant-kosmetes, is rarely found,<sup>4</sup> but was apparently the exact equivalent of the ἀντικοσμητής. The assistant secretary of the Athenian ephebi, on the other hand, was customarily called ὑπογραμματεὺς, only once ἀντιγραμματεὺς.<sup>5</sup> With these data in mind, it would seem to me just as possible to think of Zoilus in the Locrian inscription as the assistant of Timocrates as to regard him in the light of a successor. If ἀντι- and ὑπο- are elsewhere occasionally interchanged in the titles of magistrates, they may be so in the case of deputy or assistant gymnasiarchs. The ὑπογυμνασιάρχος is very common,<sup>6</sup> not supplanting but assisting the gymnasiarch.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 326.

<sup>2</sup> *SEG*, I, 366.

<sup>3</sup> The ἀντικοσμητής appears in thirty-seven Attic inscriptions of the second and third centuries of our era; e.g., *IG*, III, 1121, col. 1, l. 5. See also Forbes, *Greek Physical Education* (New York, 1929), p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> Only in *IG*, III, 1104, col. 1, l. 6, and *ibid.*, 1108, l. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 1121, col. 4, l. 21. The γραμματεὺς is also named in the inscription, so that the ἀντιγραμματεὺς was certainly his assistant or a vice-γραμματεὺς. The word ἀντιγραμματεὺς does not appear in the new edition of Liddell and Scott.

<sup>6</sup> Part of the inscriptional evidence is given by Oehler, *RE*, VII, 1979-80.

<sup>7</sup> Here Glotz, *s.v.* "Gymnasiarchia," Daremberg-Saglio, II, 1679, seems right as against Oehler, *loc. cit.*

One who perused the dissertation of Julius Menadier, *Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint inde ab Asia in formam provinciae redacta* (Berlin, 1880), might be led to believe that there is still further evidence for the ἀντιγυμνασίαρχος. On page 91, note 206, Menadier refers to CIG 2416 as naming such an official. This Naxian inscription is also to be found in IG, XII (5), 39. One will search it in vain for any trace of the antigymnasiarch, though it does make record of a hypogymnasiarch. Yet Menadier's error was carelessly repeated by so excellent a scholar as Glotz.<sup>1</sup>

Up to the present writing, then, our evidence on the antigymnasiarch is limited to the one passage of Strabo, giving the noun, and the Locrian inscription, giving the verb; but to doubt the existence of such a magistrate is no longer possible.

CLARENCE A. FORBES

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

#### NOTE ON PLATO *PARMENIDES* 129-30

Although popular expositions and comprehensive surveys of Plato's writings are continually pouring from the press, Platonic scholarship would, I sometimes think, be more furthered by direct, perhaps controversial, discussion of keynote passages about which interpreters continue to publish contrary views while taking little account of one another's opinions or arguments.

Among the passages of Plato which seem destined to what seems to me repeated and incorrigible misinterpretation, *Parmenides* 129-30 holds in my opinion a prominent place.<sup>2</sup>

What Socrates there says in substance is that to exhibit the contradictions of the one and the many in concrete material things is no great trick. Zeno's dialectics in that kind, he courteously says, is a valiant piece of work. But it would be much more wonderful and admirable to illustrate the same antinomies<sup>3</sup> in the realm of abstractions, of pure thought, of ideas. And when *Parmenides* asks him if he himself has made (and makes) this distinction between pure ideas and the things that participate in them, he replies that he does.

What commentators usually make him say is, (1) that he would be surprised (because he thinks it impossible) if anyone should find these contradictions in the ideas themselves; and (2) that he is the inventor of the distinction.

The second point is of comparatively little importance for the interpretation of Plato's philosophy, though it may easily be misused in support of the Burnet-Taylor hypothesis that Plato is virtually Socrates. I will discuss both points.

1. The first statement is essentially what Plato says less courteously and less dubitatively in the *Philebus* (14 C ff.). There Socrates affirms that the

<sup>1</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *op. cit.*, n. 19: "On trouve quelquefois aussi le titre de ἀντιγυμνασίαρχος (*Corp. inscr. gr.*, n° 2416; Strab., XIV, 5, p. 674)."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *AJP*, IX, 286-87.

<sup>3</sup> It is an ἀτοπία, not an impossibility (130 A).

opposition between the one and the many in things is a cheap commonplace which everybody now admits ought to be disregarded altogether as a hindrance to rational discussion. The only serious problem, he adds, is that of the real existence of ideas and the coexistence of unity and plurality in them. He thereupon ignores or dismisses the metaphysical aspects of the problem, and merely prescribes the right logical method, which is to assume the unity of a general idea in every indeterminate plurality and then ask into precisely how many subordinate unities the original unity may be subdivided before we abandon ourselves to the indeterminate infinity of particulars.

With this in mind let us return to the passage of the *Parmenides*. My interpretation is that *θαυμαστόν* and *θαυμάσσομαι* and their congeners cannot there be pressed to imply Socrates' (Plato's) disbelief in the possibility of exhibiting (apparent) contradictions in the ideas. There is at the most only a faint suggestion of such doubt in the words. But the main intention is to disparage Zeno's performance in contrast with the harder problem which Socrates proposes. *τί θαυμαστόν*, he says (129 B), and again, 129 D 5, *οὐδέ τι θαυμαστόν λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἅπερ ἂν πάντες ὁμολογοῖμεν* (cf. the *δεδημευμένα* of *Philebus* 14 D). The meaning of the passage is obscured for some readers by the substitution of *ἀγαίμην* and *ἀγασθείην* in 129 E, which much more nearly express admiration than skepticism.

Socrates (Plato), indeed, could not in the *Parmenides* deny the possibility of what he admits in *Republic* 476 A, that the unity of the ideas may apparently be broken up into a plurality by their communion with one another. Whatever metaphysical explanation of the paradox he may hold in reserve, it exists, and a dialectician may exhibit it more profitably than the opposition between one material object and its many predicates or qualities.

Such being the real meaning of the passage, I add a few examples of modern interpretations of it. What I think has chiefly misled interpreters who take the passage as a denial by Socrates of the possibility of combination and disintegration among the ideas themselves is the expression in 129 B, *τέρας ἂν οἶμαι ἦν*. In the practice of Athenian dialectics as illustrated by Plato and described by Aristotle, a disputant who was reduced to affirming a paradox or a gross absurdity was *ipso facto* defeated. But the entire context requires us to take the word *τέρας* and its virtual synonym *ἄσπορον* here as merely characteristic Platonic hyperboles, the dramatic intensity of expression which he gives to each idea as it presents itself. Not only, as we have seen, must the main emphasis of the passage be laid on the idea that what Zeno has done is trifling in comparison with the more difficult task that Socrates proposes, but it is flatly impossible to take *ἀγαίμην* and *ἀγασθείην* in the sense of amazement, denial, and doubt.

Socrates says that he would admire the man who could do what Parmenides does in 143 A and elsewhere, and what is done in the *Sophist* (255 A, B with 256 A, B, of *Parmenides* 129 E). The expression ("I would admire, etc.") is the virtual equivalent in Plato's style of the statement in *Charmides* 169 A,

μεγάλου δὴ τινος, ὃ φίλε, ἀνδρὸς δεῖ ὅστις τοῦτο κατὰ πάντων ἱκανῶς διαιρήσεται. It may even be compared with the remark in *Gorgias* 461 B, ταῦτα οὖν . . . οὐκ ὀλίγης συνουσίας ἐστὶν ὥστε ἱκανῶς διασκέασθαι. It is Plato's way of saying not that the problem is impossible but that it is difficult.

The interpreters and editors, as I have said, vary and are not always explicit. Proclus *Comm. in Parmenidem* (Cousin, pp. 206-7), takes ἀγαίμην, etc., as I do. Jowett, the Loeb translator, the Didot Latin version, Planck, Götz, Charles Waddington, and others emphasize the idea of astonishment or amazement with the skeptical implication. On the other hand, Schleiermacher renders it "würde mir gewaltige Freude machen"; H. Müller, "würde ich gar sehr bewundern"; Dietrich, still more clearly, "so vollbrächte er eine grosse Leistung"; Göbel, "Dann würde ich darüber freudige Bewunderung empfinden." Tocco says that the contradiction among the ideas "appare come un desideratum" and adds "vogliono dire che Platone ha già in mente quella dialettica, che espone nel Sofista."

2. The other point depends on the force of the perfect. I think it is to be taken by the analogy of κέκτησθαι and similar cases, where the perfect denotes an action or a result continuing in the present. The meaning then here would be, "Have you yourself made and do you still make this distinction which you challenge Zeno and me to apply to the antithesis of the one and the many?" The question whether Socrates is the originator of the distinction is not raised at all. For that, I think, the aorist would have been used. This interpretation I find has the support of Schleiermacher, "Machst du selbst die Absonderung von welcher du redest," possibly of Götz, and explicitly that of Waddell, who writes (*The Parmenides of Plato*, pp. xli and 82): "Is this distinction your own? says Grote; but does it not mean, You ask if Zeno has done this; have you yourself done it?" Jowett, the Loeb translator, Göbel, E. Hoffmann, and Proclus agree with Grote. H. Müller, H. Jackson, A. E. Taylor, are slightly ambiguous, and so perhaps is the Latin of Ast and the Didot edition: *Discrevistis*. In any case the words καὶ τί σοι δοκεῖ, etc., and the entire following page show that the question is not whether Socrates originated the distinction, but whether he makes it and is able and willing to maintain it.

PAUL SHOREY

#### THE BIOGRAPHY OF CICERO IN A 1491 EDITION OF PLUTARCH'S *LIVES*

Sometime ago, while engaged in a study which involved a consideration of early editions of Plutarch's *Lives*, I came across a 1491 edition<sup>1</sup> which contains the Latin translation of Plutarch by various fifteenth-century scholars. The biography of Cicero, although it bears the heading *Marci Tullii Vita ex Plutarcho Greco in Latinum per Leonardum Aretinum versa*, upon closer examination proved to be, not Plutarch's *Vita*, but Leonardo Bruni's own *Cicero*

<sup>1</sup> Ioannes Rigatius de Monteferrato, *Vitae Plutarchi* (Venetiis 1491).

*novus*.<sup>1</sup> Bruni tells us in the introduction to this work that he had been led to write it through disgust at the poor Latin translation of Plutarch's *Cicero* which had just come into his hands. At first he had intended to make a more accurate one himself, but later he departed from Plutarch and expanded his work to include *quae vel apud nostros vel apud Grecos de Cicerone scripta legeramus*.<sup>2</sup> This introductory matter is omitted in the Venice edition, but otherwise the content is in its entire form. One wonders whether such a statement as Leonardo's assertion that he had translated the orations of Aeschines and Demosthenes<sup>3</sup> would be interpreted by the uninitiated reader to refer to an accomplishment of Plutarch's. It is interesting also to speculate as to whether the man who was responsible for this edition included this work of Bruni's through ignorance of the fact that it was not a translation of Plutarch's or whether the *Cicero novus* had been deliberately substituted for the earlier imperfect translations, one of which Bruni denounces in no uncertain terms. At any rate, this fifteenth-century publication of Bruni's *Cicero* is of special interest to us, because it has hitherto been believed that the work was published for the first and only time in 1817, and a statement to this effect appears in Baron's recent edition of Bruni's philosophical works.<sup>4</sup>

DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN

WELLS COLLEGE

#### THE "PURE" MEADOW

Theocritus (xxvi. 5), describing the rites in honor of Bacchus, says they took place *ἐν καθαρῷ λεμῶνι*. Apollonius, in the *Argonautica* iii. 1202, shows Jason sacrificing to Brimo-Hecate *καθαρῶν ὑπὲρδιος εἰαμενῶν*. Seaton translates the passage from Apollonius "in a clear meadow"; Edmonds renders the Theocritus "in a lawn of the forest." Fritzsche, in his edition of Theocritus, cites Ovid *Met.* iii. 709, *purus ab arboribus spectabilis undique campus*. Similarly, commenting on Virgil, *Aen.* xii. 771, *puro . . . campo*, Forbiger correctly explains the *purus* as equivalent to *vacuus*, but refers to the foregoing phrase in Theocritus as having a similar meaning. Rumpel's lexicon to Theocritus interprets *puro . . . campo*.

There are, of course, numerous passages in which *καθαρός* is used in its original senses of "free from obstruction" (e.g., *Iliad* xxiii. 61); "pure, unpolluted" in the wider sense of the word (*θάνατος* *Od.* x. 462; *Aesch. Supp.* 652 ff.); and "pure from pollution in murder" (*Aesch. Eum.* 313; *Eurip. Ion* 1334; *Herod.*

<sup>1</sup> This work was published completely in *M. Tullii Ciceronis sex orationum partes ante nostram aetatem ineditae*, by Augustus Mai (Milan, 1817), pp. 255-301. It also appears in part in *Leonardo Bruni Aretino Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften*, by Hans Baren (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 113-20.

<sup>2</sup> Baron ed., p. 113.

<sup>4</sup> P. 164.

<sup>3</sup> Venice ed., II, lxxxix.

i. 35). The foregoing translations and comments on Theocritus and Apollonius show that *καθαρός* in the passages cited has been taken to mean *vacuus* or *purus* in the general sense. It is more probable, however, as will be seen below, that the word as used by these two poets is employed almost as a formula, with a special connotation, that of the spiritual and ritual purity emphasized in the Orphic cult.

There are numerous examples of its peculiar cult meaning, of which perhaps the best known are in the tablets described by Jane E. Harrison, *Prolegomena*, page 663 ff.; e.g., *ἔρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν, καθαρὰ χθονίων βασιλεία*. These tablets are also described in JHS, III (1882), 114–15. For a further example of the cult use of the word cf. Plato *Phaedo* 69 E.

Brimo-Hecate is connected with the Orphic worship. This goddess, who was worshiped at Pherae, is sometimes identified with Demeter. She is thus associated with the Eleusinian mysteries, in which the hierophant announced the birth of Inachos-Brimos from Persephone-Brimo: *ιερόν ἔτεκε πότνια κοῦρον βριμὸν βριμόν*. Cf. Hippolytus *Philosophumena* v. 1 (trans. by Legge, I, 138), and Foucart, *Les mystères d'Eleusis*, page 479. The fact that Persephone appears in both the Orphic and the Eleusinian cults, coupled with the presence of Bacchus in the Orphic cult, tends to support the ritual use of *καθαρός* in both Theocritus and Apollonius.

Orphic influence is also seen in Apollonius in the song of Orpheus (i. 494 ff.). It is to be noted that this song shows the later phases of the belief.

*Καθαρός* in general literature frequently has a special significance when used in eschatological and chthonic passages, e.g., Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1575 ff.:

τὸν ὦ Γᾶς παῖ καὶ Ταρτάρου  
κατέλχομαι ἐν καθαρῷ βῆναι  
δρμωμένῳ νερτέρᾳ  
τῷ ξένῳ νεκρῶν πλάκας.

Jebb interprets "And I pray that he [Cerberus] may leave a clear path for the stranger." While this is no doubt satisfactory, the use of *καθαρός* in this connection may not be entirely without special connotation.

It is noteworthy that *καθαρός* does not occur in the *Bacchae* of Euripides, which we may assume Theocritus knew. The only word of similar connotation is in 72 ff.:

ὦ μάκαρ, ὅστις εὐδαίμων  
τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδὼς  
φιστὰν ἀγιστεβει  
καὶ θιασέεται ψυχάν,  
ἐν δρεσσι βακχείων  
δοίοις καθαρμοῖσιν.

The close connection of *λειμών* with the mysteries is shown by the following passages: Tablets in JHS, Volume III, quoted above:

Χαῖρε, χαῖρε δεξιὰν ὁδοιπορῶν  
λειμώνάς τε ῥεοὺς κατ' ἄλσέα Φερσεφονείας.

Abel, *Orphica*, frag. 154:

Οἱ μὲν κ' εὐαγέωσιν ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἡλίου  
αὐτὶς ἀποφθίμενοι μαλακώτερον οἶκον ἔχουσιν  
ἐν καλῷ λειμῶνι βαθύρρουν ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντα.

The description of the lower world in Plut. *De anima*, frag. vi, Bernardakis (=Stob. *Flor.* cxx. 28 [Meineke, p. 107]), contains the significant phrase τόποι καθαροὶ καὶ λειμῶνες. In the same passage: ὁ παντελής . . . σύνεστιν ὁσίους καὶ καθαροῖς ἀνδράσι . . . τὸν ἀμύητον ἐνταῦθα τῶν ζώντων ἀκάθαρτον ἐφορῶν ὄχλον. Lobeck (*Agl.*, p. 61) believed that this passage referred to the mysteries themselves; but it is now more correctly interpreted as referring to the happy future life of the initiates.

Examples of similar use in eschatological passages in general literature are *Anth. Pal.* vii. 189:

Οὐκέτι δὴ σε λίγεια κατ' ἀφρονὲν Ἀλκίδος οἶκον  
ἀκρὶ μελιζομένην ὕψεται ἀέλιος·  
Ἦδὲ γὰρ λειμῶνας ἐπὶ Κλυμένου πεπότησται  
καὶ δρυσερὰ χρυσέας ἀνθεα Περσεφόνας.

*Cons. ad Liv.* 329-30:

Ille pio, si non temere haec creduntur, in arvo  
inter honoratos excipietur avos.

It is to be noted that λειμῶν is qualified in all these by an adjective of holiness or sanctity. Thus use with an adjective is also well shown in Eurip. *Hipp.* 73-77:

σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκήρατου  
λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,  
ἐνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βοτὰ  
οὔτ' ἡλθέ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον  
μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἥρινόν διέρχεται.

Following Boisacq, we may assume that the κηρ- contained in the first ἀκήρατος here is identical with the root of κηραίνω. The passage may be one of the wordplays of which the tragic writers are so fond; and it may be intended to evoke association with κείρω. The meadow is undefiled (κηραίνω) because uncut (κείρω; cf. οὔτ' ἡλθέ πω σίδηρος) and hence sacred. The second use of ἀκήρατος may thus be a play on the first. The scholia B, Fl. 15, and M interpret lines 73-74 as ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας. This is obviously allegorical, but is important as indicating the realization that there was a particular significance to be attached to the phrase. Further implication may be given to the passage by the fact that Hippolytus was an initiate of the σεμνῶν . . . μυστηρίων (l. 25).

Supporting the possibility of the wordplay and the mystic use of ἀκήρατος, we have Eurip. *Hipp.* 949 (the words of Theseus ridiculing the Orphic mysteries as impostures and delusions):

σὺ σὼφρων καὶ κακῶν ἀκήρατος;



The scholiast explains: ἀκούων ἀμύαντος τῶν κακῶν. Eurip. *Hipp.* 1108 ff. (chorus):

εἶθε μοι εὐξαμένα θεόθεν τάδε μοῖρα παράσχοι  
τύχαν μετ' ὀλβίου καὶ ἀκήρατον ἄλγεσι θυμόν.

In both these passages ἀκήρατος might be equally well identified with either κηραίνω or κεραίζω.

A similar description of a sacred meadow is found in Soph. *Trach.* 200:

ὦ Ζεῦ, τὸν Οἴτης ἄτομον ὅς λειμῶν' ἔχεις—

Jebb's notes are as follows: The uplands of Oeta were sacred to Zeus. Demeter reproves the woodcutter in her grove (Call. *Hymn. Cer.* 47). In a Cretan precinct of Dictaeon Zeus it was forbidden to keep flocks or sheepfolds, to sow, or to cut timber (*CIG*, II, 1003). (For this passage cf. *Hipp.* 73–77 cited above.) With ἄτομον cf. Hesych. ἀδρέπανον· ἄδρεπτον· θεοῖς ἀνακείμενον.

Thus we have the formulaic use of λειμῶν in passages of eschatology or ritual, with an adjective of ritual purity, καθαρός, ἀκήρατος, ἄτομος, etc. The passages from Theocritus and Apollonius must be included in the same category, showing, as they do, the association of noun and adjective, in which each is colored by the other. Moreover, they must be distinguished as representing a formula of cult ritual. The interpretation of Apollonius is further supported by the fact that καθαρός does not occur elsewhere in the *Argonautica*, and that although λειμῶν occurs in five passages, and εἵαμενῇ in four other than that cited, none of the usages is in connection with worship or sacrifice.

It is improbable, in view of the importance of καθαρός as a cult word, and of the use of λειμῶν in eschatology beginning with the Elysian fields and continuing in the Orphic literature (cf. the tablets and Abel's fragments) that their association and use in general literature is wholly fortuitous and of a merely descriptive nature. The use seems hitherto not to have been recognized or remarked. Paley comes closest to the correct interpretation in his note on the *Hippolytus*, line 73, in which he speaks of the appropriateness of the offering of "sacred flowers from a virgin field to a virgin goddess from a virgin hand." This observation, of course, does not exhaust the implications of the passage, although in a general way it points to the interpretation presented above.

R. E. GLANVILLE DOWNEY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Mélanges Paul Thomas: Recueil de mémoires concernant la philologie classique.* Dédié à PAUL THOMAS, professeur émérite et ancien recteur de l'Université de Gand, membre de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, correspondant de l'Institut de France. Bruges: Imprimerie Sainte Catherine, 35 Rue du Tram, 1930.

A committee of fifty got together and serves this feast of scholarship, and it would require a committee almost as large, and more space than is at my disposal, to review it adequately. Nothing more than a bare notice can be attempted here.

There are seventy-eight articles by as many contributors. There is no good reason for singling out individuals for mention, but as I turn the pages and browse here and there my eye catches the names of Bidez, Cagnet, Carcopino, Castiglioni, Constans, Cumont, Ernout, Grégoire, Haskins, Knapp, Marouzeau, Monceaux, Pirenne, Sabbadini, Ussani. There are some thirty-five articles on Latin literature, eight on Greek literature, fourteen or fifteen on ancient history and institutions, about ten on mediaeval topics, and archaeology, Roman law, epigraphy, papyrology, Latin language, linguistics, science, metric, and Greek philosophy are not unrepresented. In short, there is something for everybody. A useful Bibliography of Professor Thomas, compiled by Professor Paul Faider, runs to 423 numbers.

In terms antithetic to Dr. Johnson's condemnation to all posterity of the famous mutton the book may be characterized as *well* written, *well* edited, *well* indexed, *well* printed. It should be on the shelves of every university library.

---

PAUL SHOREY

*Selections from the Brief Mention of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve.* Edited by CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. With a Biographical Sketch and an Index. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. \$4.50.

Somebody in Thackeray, I believe, complains that he has waited in vain for a chance to quote opportunely "Tu quoque litoribus nostris Aeneia nutrix." The appearance of the long-expected book of *Brief Mention* at last makes it appropriate for me to quote without shame the cliché, "Indocti discant et ament meminisse periti." The fast-waning generation that eagerly anticipated the wit and wisdom of *Brief Mention* every three months will love to renew their memories, and the book will convey to the ἀλκιμοὶ νεανίαι of today something of the inspiration of the great personality that gave to the

work of the great scholar and teacher whom we knew its inimitable flavor and tang.

One of these little essays is an apology for or a defense of the discursive mind. Gildersleeve's discursiveness needs no apology. He was perfectly capable of consecutive reasoning and deep-burrowing scholarship, as his Greek Syntax, his Latin Grammar, his Notes on Justin Martyr, his Pindar, and his Essays and Studies amply prove. But his quick and impatient mind preferred to pack infinite riches in a little room and to speak, in the phrase of his favorite Pindar, words that had a voice and meaning for the intelligent. And there are many paragraphs in this volume from which an intelligent student will learn more than from many a demonstration in logical or philological mood and figure that the moon is made of green cheese.

Professor Miller, for many years Gildersleeve's assistant and colleague, has done the work of selection and editing well. He has added an interesting sketch of Gildersleeve's life and a complete Bibliography. And the elaborate indexes and the long list of the sources of the quotations both latent and explicit add greatly to the value of the book and make its stores of learning and suggestion readily accessible.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart, im Rahmen einer allgemeinen Geschichte des griechischen Unterrichts.* By ENGELBERT DRERUP. Erster Teil: *Vom XV. bis zum Ende des XVII. Jahrhunderts.* "Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums," Ergänzungsband VI. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1930. Pp. viii + 488.

When Dr. Drerup, relinquishing his professorial duties in Germany, betook himself to Nymwegen (Holland) to take up the chair of Greek in the newly founded university of that city, he was struck by the way in which Greek was pronounced there. But his astonishment was still greater when, upon inquiring, he was told that the pronunciation in general use in Holland was the original Erasmian pronunciation continuously in use in that country since the time of its inception and the only one that had ever been known to exist. Having never heard of another "Erasmian" pronunciation besides the one in use in Germany and most of the continental countries of Europe, one which though etacistic follows the Latin rules of accentuation, Dr. Drerup found himself face to face with the question whether both pronunciations can be rightly fathered on Erasmus, or, if only the one goes back to the great humanist, what is the origin of the other and why it too has come to be known as Erasmian. This problem Dr. Drerup endeavors to solve in a work of which the present volume is the first part, and which, we feel sure, will be read with great interest by all students of Greek.

In a short introductory chapter the author gives a brief but clear statement of the problem. He tells us at the outset that after careful examination of the sources he found that the pronunciation current in Holland and England has no right to be termed Erasmian, that it was first advocated by Henninius toward the latter part of the seventeenth century, and later through the influence of the great Dutch scholars gained considerable ascendancy all over Europe, but that soon, owing to the reaction of the new humanists of Germany, its territory was restricted to Holland and England, where it is used to this day. He further states that he intends to give an exposé of the different attempts to reform the traditional pronunciation and a description of the struggle for supremacy between the followers of Erasmus and those of Reuchlin. He has read all books accessible to him bearing on the question of Greek pronunciation after the time of Erasmus, giving us here a brief summary of their contents and indicating their attitude in the controversy. Disclaiming any intention of producing a *sprachwissenschaftliches* work, he modestly tells us that his purpose is to give a historical account of the way in which Greek was taught in Europe after the revival of learning, hoping only indirectly to arouse interest for practical reforms.

The main body of the work is divided into five chapters. The first deals with a short consideration of the philological activities of the early Greek scholars, most of them modern Greek refugees, who through their grammatical works gave an impetus to the study of Greek among Europeans. These scholars, although teaching Greek according to the traditional pronunciation, admitted, especially in conversations within the walls of the Aldine Academy, that the modern pronunciation is not identical with that of the ancients. In this respect they may be truly called the first forerunners of Erasmus, though his immediate predecessors were the Spanish scholar Antonio of Lebrixa and the Italians Aldus Manutius and Girolamo Aleandro, who were the first to formulate a protest against the prevailing pronunciation of Greek. Their interest, however, was purely theoretical. To quote Aleandro: "Scientiam loquendi nobis reservantes usum populo concedamus."

Erasmus' dialogue *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione* . . . (Basel, 1528) was the result of conversations and discussions in the Aldine Academy and of personal contacts with his predecessors, Antonio of Lebrixa and Aleandro. But although the new pronunciation did not originate with Erasmus, great credit is due him for having been the first to present it in a systematic and scientific way and for having stimulated active interest in the new reform. Furthermore, Erasmus' purpose in writing this dialogue was not only to effect a change in the current pronunciation of the classical languages, but also to suggest a reform in the whole paedagogical system of his time.

The author proceeds to give a detailed analysis of the contents of the dialogue and to account for the tradition that Erasmus failed to practice the pronunciation which he advocated, dismissing briefly the legend about his "mystification." The so-called Erasmian pronunciation in use in Holland to-

day has no right to the name, since Erasmus differentiates between accent and quantity, keeping both, but he advocates no shift in the accent of the Greek words as was done with the Greek loan-words in Latin. The immediate successors of Erasmus, Juan Luis de Vivès and Clenardus, though indebted to him in some points did not adopt his pronunciation.

The next chapter is devoted to a discussion of the controversy at Cambridge between the classical scholars Thomas Smith and John Cheke, on the one hand, and Stephan Gardiner, chancellor of Cambridge, on the other. Smith and Cheke had the "temerity" to introduce into their courses the "Erasmian" pronunciation, at which they arrived quite independently from Erasmus. There followed a heated exchange of acrimonious correspondence, but finally the controversy came to an end by Gardiner's edict, issued in 1542, which won the day for the followers of the traditional pronunciation. However, after the accession of Elizabeth to the English throne in 1558 the new pronunciation was universally adopted, and although capable defenders of tradition, such as Cajus and Gregorius Martinus, were not lacking, the new reform was solidly established at the beginning of the seventeenth century, finding its best advocate in Thomas Gataker.

The following chapter deals with the propagation of the Erasmian pronunciation in Western Switzerland, France, and the Netherlands. One of the most important defenders of the new reform was Theodorus Beza, who in his *Alphabetum Graecum* gives a comprehensive analysis and a vigorous defense of the new system. But for all its thoroughness his book did not achieve any practical results, since even in 1815 the traditional pronunciation appears in use in Geneva.

In France even as late as 1540 the Erasmian system does not count any followers. The first officially to introduce it into that country was Angelo Canini (1521-57), but the most influential Erasmians in France were Petrus Ramus (1515-72), Jean Passerat (1534-1602), and Henricus Stephanus (1531-98), the great editor and publisher of Greek texts, who in the latter capacity started an effective propaganda in favor of the new reform.

Among the enemies of Erasmianism in France the most outstanding were Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609), who, however, made some concessions to the new movement; Isaac Casaubonus, who, though not actively interested in the question, inclined toward the traditional pronunciation; and Claudius Salmasius of Leyden. In church circles the modern Greek pronunciation held absolute sway. The study of the modern Greek language, likewise, was not entirely neglected. In 1638 Simon Portius dedicated his grammar of Romaic Greek to Richelieu, and even in the Sorbonne in the seventeenth century the modern Greek pronunciation found its supporters, e.g., Gilles Ménage, made fun of by Molière in his *Femmes savantes*; and in literature Claude Capperonnier in the beginning of the eighteenth century lends his support to the old pronunciation. But with the conversion of the Jesuits and the Jansenists, previously the stronghold of tradition, to the new reform the Erasmians won

a decisive victory in France. Lancelot's *Nouvelle méthode* and *Jardin des racines grecques* were of great practical and theoretical importance. In short, at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century the Erasmian pronunciation had won an almost incontestable victory.

In Holland the universities of Louvain (Justus Lipsius), of Bruges (Adolphus Mekerchus), and of Leyden (Gerhard Johann Vossius) through their influence prepared the way for a complete success of the Erasmian reform in spite of the colossal figures of Scaliger, Hugo Grotius, and Salmasius, who still clung to tradition.

In the next section the author considers the resistance of the "vulgar pronunciation" in Italy, Spain, and Germany. In Italy the church through its various orders, and the state through its contacts with modern Greece, procured a long life for the old pronunciation. Its critics, such as Valeriano and Muretus, confined themselves to an academic discussion of the question without aspiring to practical reforms. In Spain, likewise, Vergara, though theoretically in favor of Erasmianism, accepted the usual pronunciation as the more practical. However, the general tendency throughout the seventeenth century is in favor of the new system, chiefly owing to the influence of the Jesuit school.

In Germany the most important representatives of the traditional pronunciation were Reuchlin, Melancthon, Johannes Sturm, Martin Crusius, Aemilius Portus, and especially Erasmus Schmidt, who wrote a valiant defense of it. But in spite of the great influence of these scholars Reuchlianism was gradually declining in Germany. For Erasmianism too was represented by a number of very capable men, such as Janus Gruterus of Heidelberg; Friedrich Sylburg, who edited with great success the grammar of Clenardus; Petrus Ramus; and above all the Jesuit Jacob Gretser, who in 1592 was charged to enlarge and edit the grammar of Clenardus. The success of this work was enormous and it went through a great number of editions. For practical purposes it accepts the Reuchlian pronunciation though in theory it is thoroughly Erasmian. The order was opposed to any changes in the pronunciation of the language, especially if these changes originated in Protestant communities. Still Gretser managed to introduce certain Erasmian influences into his grammar, mainly concerning the alphabet and the diphthongs.

In Northern Germany Andreas Helvigius gains new friends for the Erasmian cause, and the new grammars published there are etacistic, yet, as may be gathered from Jac. Weller's grammar, Erasmianism did not completely vanquish its opponents.

Although considerably weakened, Reuchlianism produced some of its most formidable defenders about the end of the seventeenth century. Chief among them was Joh. Rodolphus Wetstenius, who in a collection of speeches gave the best defense of the traditional pronunciation ever written, considering the question from all points of view and refuting one by one all the arguments of



its opponents. Yet his treatment is not free from a lack of *sprachwissenschaftliches Verständnis*, a defect with which were afflicted all those engaged in the pronunciation controversy.

In the beginning of the eighteenth century the circle of Erasmians widens in Germany. An outstanding member of this circle was D'Ancillon, who in a work entitled *De pronuntiatione vocalis* <sup>7</sup>HTA combated and effectively refuted all of the major arguments of Wetstenius. The *Märkische Grammatik* published at this time gave an additional impetus to the Erasmian movement.

The last chapter of the volume considers in detail the origin of the "etacistic-quantitative" pronunciation of Greek in use at present in Holland and England, of which a brief sketch was given in the beginning of the book. By the end of the seventeenth century the study of Greek all over Europe had begun to decline, chiefly as the result of the theological controversies which were ravaging the entire continent of Europe at that time. It is under these conditions that the foundation of the new "paradoxical" pronunciation was laid. One of its pioneers was Isaac Vossius, who made a distinction between the traditional system of accentuation and the "true" system of the ancients based on the quantity of the syllables. The accentual signs of the modern Greek language were invented at a late period for the purpose of distinguishing between ambiguous words (*πρὸς διαστολὴν τῆς ἀμφιβόλου λέξεως*). Vossius' reputation in Holland and England made his theories acceptable in those countries. The new reform found warm friends in Joannes Verwey, Graevius, and especially Henninius, who in his *ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ ΟΡΘΩΔΙΟΣ* maintained that Greek should not be pronounced according to the accents but rather according to the quantities of the syllables and in line with the Latin rules of accentuation. But despite the erudition and vigor with which he defends his thesis, his book betrays no scientific knowledge of the later history of Greek and a complete misconception of linguistic principles.

Henninius' theories found very few sympathizers. Chief among them was Johann Daniel Major, an authority on numismatics, who advanced additional support for the new theory from coins, but in an impassionate and uncritical manner. On the other hand, it was attacked by many, most successful of whom was Wetstein, who in the second edition of his *Orationes apologeticae* (1685) refuted Henninius' contentions with force and persuasion based on philological insight and critical acumen if not on a satisfactory linguistic training. But the fact that he was an avowed Reuchlinian militated against a wider acceptance of his opinions.

The author has written a very thorough work and one that is on a par with his other numerous philological productions. It is well documented and systematically arranged. Its apparent prolixity is due to the fact that Dr. Drerup allows himself—and this is fortunate for his readers—to quote rather copiously from various works which would not be accessible except at the cost of much labor and time, and to give detailed analyses of their contents to such an



extent as to render this work a virtual "miniature library." Unlike most other books quoting from Greek texts, it is remarkably free from errors of accentuation and spelling and gives one the impression of a carefully published work.

We sympathize with the author for his long labors and the hardships which he endured while visiting the different libraries of Europe, and we hasten to assure him that in our opinion he has found ample remuneration in the present work, a monument to his industry and erudition, and a real contribution to the knowledge of the history of Greek studies in Europe.

PROCOPE S. COSTAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Die Platonischen Schriften.* Von PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1930. M. 38.

The second volume of Professor Friedländer's comprehensive work applies to the continuous analysis of the Platonic writings the principles and methods of interpretation set forth in the first volume already reviewed in this journal.<sup>1</sup> Professor Friedländer is so fearful of imposing a system upon Plato that he does not attempt a systematic account even of Plato's ethical and political philosophy. He deprecates what seems to me the convenient and almost indispensable expression, the "theory of ideas," which I agree with him is often misused.<sup>2</sup> And in his application of the sound principle that Plato like Nature in Aristotle does nothing in vain,<sup>3</sup> he leaves a little less room than I would do for the play of accident and caprice in determining the employment of literary motifs. But these slight divergences in the theory of method do not affect the admiration that I have already expressed for the general soundness of his practice.

The first thing, then, to commend in the book is its comparative freedom from the errors and irrationalities that mar our enjoyment of so many recent learned and ingenious contributions to the literature of Platonism. Professor Friedländer would not claim infallibility. There are many facets of Plato's kaleidoscopic art which different minds will always view differently. But Professor Friedländer rarely, if ever, supports his personal opinions by misinterpreting the text, making false points, adducing irrelevant parallel passages, and mistaking possibilities for certainties. He accepts the generally accepted Platonic chronology in its broader outlines, but wastes little time on the endeavor to extract from insufficient evidence a precise chronological sequence for all the dialogues.<sup>4</sup> He in fact admits that in many cases a more detailed chronology would make little difference, and frankly avows that the sequence of the dialogues in his own book is often a matter of convenience in the pres-

<sup>1</sup> XXIII, 293-97.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., pp. 84, 204; so also I, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. 461 and I, 189, 185, "Platon konnte in seinem Werk kein Zufälliges dulden."

<sup>4</sup> P. 690.

entation of the thought.<sup>1</sup> He puts more faith in the style statistic of von Arnim than in arguments based on the supposed evolution of Plato's thought. Yet curiously enough the chief scientific value that he attributes to von Arnim's results is that they prove the validity of the method by the fact that they confirm what we already know.<sup>2</sup> He recognizes that some dialogues are apparently more mature than others and that some elaborate explicitly ideas that others merely suggest or take for granted. But he makes the dialogues grow out of Plato's mind and not out of one another, and he does not represent the evolution of Plato's philosophy as a series of scene-shifting, melodramatic adventures, surprises, and *Stimmungen*.<sup>3</sup> He does not admit contradiction and inconsistencies in Plato's thoughts if any other reasonable explanation can be found of the variations in their dramatic expression. His main reliance is on a careful and sober analysis of the course of the argument in every dialogue. The "motivation" of the argument by such external and conjectural causes as Plato's moods, his polemical intentions or allusions, and the vicissitudes of Athenian life and politics he repeatedly says is equivalent to the renunciation of all rational interpretation.<sup>4</sup> Plato, he frequently reminds us, usually directs his polemic not against any particular historical opponent but against an adversary who is a generalized embodiment of the ideas and tendencies which he wishes to combat.<sup>5</sup> Many of the fashionable commonplaces of recent Platonic literature Professor Friedländer hardly deigns to mention though he is obviously familiar with them. He has little or nothing to say of the supposed elimination of piety by the *Euthyphro*, of the great "discovery" of right opinion at the end of the *Meno*, of the crisis in Plato's thought indicated by the criticism of the "theory of ideas" in the *Parmenides*, of the metaphysical as opposed to the ethical interpretation of the *Philebus*. He is well acquainted not only with the German but with the French, Italian, English, and American literature of Platonism. He does ample justice to the many good points in Taylor's Plato, but he mentions only once, I think, and then to reject it, the distinctive Burnet-Taylor hypothesis on which so much ink has been wasted, and the name of Lutoslawski does not, I believe, occur in his 690 pages.

But negations merely clear away the rubbish, and Professor Friedländer's book is essentially constructive. He has a very keen and delicate feeling for the motives and niceties of Plato's dramatic art and their relation to the course of the argument. He makes no attempt, however, to bring them home to the general reader by translation, paraphrase, and modern analogy. But his analyses are introduced and throughout accompanied by many fine and subtle observations, of which all future interpreters must take account, and which the practical teacher of Plato, if he knows how to adapt them concretely

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 683 ff., 687.

<sup>2</sup> P. 682.

<sup>3</sup> P. 528 and *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> P. 362; cf. pp. 436, 498, 558-59, 607, 613.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., p. 206.

to his teaching, will find most helpful. In one group of these observations as already hinted I cannot always follow him. Like Proclus, though, of course with much greater critical reserve,<sup>1</sup> he is inclined to discover anticipations and suggestions of the thought of most dialogues in the dramatic introductions and settings. How far this method should be carried is, I presume, a question of measure and perhaps of taste and personal opinion. I would leave some room for the play of accident and am, for example, not quite convinced that Plato intended the festival of the imperfectly Hellenized barbarians at the beginning of the *Republic* to be understood as "die rechte Begleitmelodie grade für den Kampf mit Thrasymachos," or that when in reply to Socrates' statement that he is going straight to the Lyceum his friends banteringly say, "You'd better come straight to us," the repetition "muss etwas Besonderes bedeuten," or that Theaetetus halts at Megara on the way from Corinth to Athens because the Megarian dialectic is intermediate between the dialectic of Zeno and that of Socrates and Plato, or that we are to look for any special significance in the fact that in the *Phaedrus* Socrates goes out from the city walls, while in the *Lysis* he follows them "auf kürzestem Wege von einer Ringschule zur andern." In these and many similar cases I wonder if Professor Friedländer is not overworking the sometimes helpful principle that "es wäre seltsam wenn sich dieser Gedanke bei uns einstellte ohne von Platon gemeint zu sein." But inasmuch as Professor Friedländer does not use these symbolisms for the deduction and predetermination of the thought, but only for its illustration, they can do no harm.

To turn now to the main substance of the book, it is impossible to analyze here these nearly seven hundred pages of closely reasoned analyses. The general reader may find them harder reading than the résumés of Jowett or Taylor, less attractively humanized, not to say novelized, than the story as related by Wilamowitz, less enlivened by modern illustration than the discursively exhaustive summaries of Grote. But they are, I think, more critical and grapple more closely with Plato's thought as interwoven with his dramatic art. They also take account of the work of other scholars, not only in vague, noncommittal terms, but on definitely formulated issues and in the interpretation and text criticism, where relevant, of particular passages. No student of Plato can afford to neglect them.

Instead of attempting the impossible, I will conclude this notice with a partial enumeration of the many points on which I think Professor Friedländer is entirely right, and of some of the few opinions in which I am unable to follow him. Of the latter I have already mentioned his acceptance of the letters. I am still in doubt about the first *Alcibiades*, which he accepts unqualifiedly and which seems to me a little too Platonic. One or two sentences in the *Hippias Major* still offend me, though again there is nothing un-Platonic in the thought, and I cannot understand his defense of what seems to me the un-Platonic and superstitious treatment of the *daimonion* in the *Theages*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. his own observations I, 186.

These differences of taste or personal opinion affect very slightly, if at all, his interpretation of the writings or his estimate of the personality of Plato. He is, to mention at random a few examples, I think, entirely right in his frequent denials of the fallacies and inconsistencies which other scholars find in Plato;<sup>1</sup> in his distrust of most endeavors to determine the dates of the dialogues by their philosophical content; in maintaining that the minor dialogues point and lead up to and converge upon the *Republic*;<sup>2</sup> that a Platonic dialogue cannot be explained by attributing to it a single purpose;<sup>3</sup> in correcting or rejecting many of the fancies, emendations, and oversights of Professor Wilamowitz. More particularly he is right in maintaining that the *Ion*, *Apology*, and *Protagoras* do have a positive philosophic content;<sup>4</sup> that the truth of the *Apology* is ideal, not factual; that there is no real contradiction between what is said of immortality in the *Apology* and in the *Phaedo*; that Plato always understood the  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu$  fallacy; that the method of diaeresis is no new discovery in the *Sophist*, that it is not to be taken too seriously there, and that Stenzel's attempt to distinguish the diaeresis of the *Republic* from that of the *Sophist* breaks down;<sup>5</sup> that Plato probably did not seriously intend to write the *Philosophus*; that the theory of pleasure in the *Republic* and the *Philebus* is not appreciably different; that the long paraenesis of the *Menexenus* is not, as Pohlenz suggests, ironical; that in the reference to the friends of ideas "Platon sich auf Platon bezieht"; that Plato's alleged prolixity is justifiable; that the  $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  of the *Phaedo* is not really "ein Verfahren minderen Ranges";<sup>6</sup> that Plato does satirize Anytus in the *Meno*.

With all the definiteness and trenchancy of his criticism he seems to me to be scrupulously fair in his treatment of scholars with whom he happens to differ.

PAUL SHOREY

*Lucian's Relation to Plato and the Post-Aristotelian Philosophers.*

By WILSON HAMILTON TACKABERRY. "University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series," No. 9, 1930.

Twenty years after the untimely death of its author, this monograph is published by his wife and the University of Toronto. The frontispiece is a beautiful portrait which the friends, colleagues, and teachers of Mr. Tackaberry will greatly prize. There is a brief introductory memoir by Principal Maurice Hutton. And the editor, Professor G. O. Smith, reminds us that the essay never received the author's finishing touches and apologizes for any possible oversights in the editing. The work, he says, is *professione pietatis excusatum*.

No apologies of any kind are needed. The monograph as it stands, and regardless of trifling inadvertences, is the best, the sanest, and the most nearly

<sup>1</sup> E.g., pp. 325, 340.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 131 and 133.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 47, 71, 190, 292, etc.; cf. I, 8, 158, 189.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 382 and 212.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 219, 247, etc.

<sup>6</sup> P. 334.

complete treatment of its subject extant. It is well written and readable. And the five hundred and seventy-nine footnotes and the Appendix are a very nearly if not quite exhaustive guide to the sources. No student of Lucian or of the history of Platonism can afford to neglect this modest little book.

PAUL SHOREY

*The Original "Iliad": The Solution of the Homeric Question.* By ROBINSON SMITH, author of *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem*. Nice, France, 1930. 14to. Pp. 140.

Mr. Smith is an itinerant higher critic who after demolishing the gospels of Matthew and Luke as well as the epistles of the New Testament takes the same tools and reduces the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to powder, then moves on to the easier task of showing Cervantes and Spenser their proper place.

The author detects twenty-five major categories of errors in Homer, among which are ignorance of digamma, illicit hiatus, neuter plural subject with singular verb, absence of caesura from the middle of the verse, use of the forbidden diaeresis, the use of  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  for  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ , the ictus on non-important words, the use of  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  without the corresponding  $\delta\epsilon$ , and other similar defects. By application of these unerring rules or tests he unhesitatingly banishes over twelve thousand verses from the *Iliad* as unworthy of any poet, least of all of the great Homer. Some of these verses have as many as eight glaring defects, some have only one, but the total errors due to the ignorance and the incompetency of the wretched bunglers who ruined the *Iliad* amount to many more than thirty thousand.

By applying these tests he arrives at a perfect poem, a little gem of flawless texture, not a missing digamma, not an absent caesura, not a bad diaeresis, not a single  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ , but one uniform and harmonious language everywhere.

However, historical Greece never produced a poet of one harmonious language, all were influenced by traditions, by poetic origins. Who could guess the daily dialect used by Pindar, Theognis, or Theocritus from their poetry? Convention was the very breath of Greek poetry, and Homer can be freed from the assumption of this convention only by the wilder assumption that he lived before there were any poetic traditions and that he was the first of all poets.

Mr. Smith asserts that Homer never neglected the digamma, and the mere absence of digamma in any verse makes Homeric authorship impossible. Where is there any historical parallel to this unvarying use? Buck, *Greek Dialects*, page 44, says that even in those regions of Greece where the use of the digamma persisted fullest and longest, "the spelling with digamma and the spelling without digamma occur promiscuously, even in the same inscriptions." This to my mind is exactly the linguistic stage represented by Homer. Mr. Smith can hardly be rash enough to reject from these inscriptions all words in which the digamma is neglected. Every one of his twenty-five tests

lacks just the needed foundation of fact. Not one of them is supported by a single literary parallel, while on every hand there is abundant proof that each is due to an error.

How exacting Mr. Smith is and how keen his feeling for poetry has become can best be illustrated by his comments on N 27-28. These are the famous verses which describe the movement of Poseidon as he hastens over the waves to succor the wavering Greeks.

βῆ δ' ἐλάαν ἐπὶ κύματ'. ἀταλλε δὲ κήτε' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ  
πάντοθεν ἐκ κευθμῶν, οὐδ' ἠγνοίησεν ἀνακτα'.

Let us object: (1) something is wrong with the form *κευθμῶν*, the proper nominative being *κευθμών*; (2) *ἀταλλε* is a once-used word; (3) *αὐτοῦ* is wrongly in an emphatic position; (4) we have two elisions in structure-words, *κύματ'*, *κήτε'*; (5) but what really damns the lines is their sense: Homer tells us that the sea stood asunder, so that the axle beneath Poseidon's chariot was not even wet, in other words that it ran on dry ground, but the interpolator in these lines tells us that he drove across the waves and that the sea beasts frolicked beneath them, and he tells this by matching up a neuter plural noun with singular verbs.

However, Vergil did not think the idea of Poseidon driving over the sea while the waves stood aside and made way for him damned the poetry, since he took it right over in the famous passage which contains the verse.

Atque rotis summas levibus perlabitur undas,

This is all a matter of taste, but the assumption that Homer pictured the god of the sea bumping in his chariot over the dry bottom of the Aegean while the waters stood in sheer walls on either side seems to me so absurd that it would damn the reputation of even a Homer.

This book by Mr. Smith might have found a friendly audience a generation ago, but now all scholars are agreed that a great poem was never produced by ignorant imitators, botchers, and impostors, and the present *Iliad* is by common consent a great poem.

JOHN A. SCOTT

---

*The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome.* By EUNICE BURR STEBBINS. A dissertation submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co., 1929.

The casual observer or even the student of archaeology and of the history of art is accustomed to look upon the dolphin as represented in classical art with little more than passing interest, accepting it, for more or less clearly defined reasons, as the attribute of certain divinities. Few have sought further knowledge.

In her dissertation bearing the foregoing title Miss Stebbins gives us the first detailed study in English of the dolphin's place in the literature, legends,



and folklore of the Greeks and Romans, and of its representations in their art. Her treatment of the subject is logical.

Turning first to natural history, she determines from scientific sources the nature and appearance of the dolphin, reconciles the findings of modern zoölogists with allusions in classical literature, and so establishes a basis for identification of the creature as represented in art. She then discusses the types and various conventions employed by the artists, and finds that in all periods the figure was drawn or sculptured for decorative effect, with little care for anatomical correctness.

The third chapter of the dissertation is devoted to the dolphin in Minoan art; the fourth to its appearance in Helladic, Cycladic, and Cyprian art; and the fifth to its representation in the geometric period, in which the fibula comes in as a field for dolphin display. While many representations are discussed in these three chapters, the number is really small in proportion to the length of the periods, and the writer has evidently been thorough in listing the existing specimens.

Throughout all divisions of the prehistoric period, with three possible exceptions, the dolphin was either a purely decorative feature or was used to suggest the sea. The three exceptions are, first, a late Minoan III vase from the tomb of Phaistos; second, though probably earlier in date than the foregoing, a fragment of a Cycladic vase, presumably of the M.C. III period; third, a larnax from Palaikastro. In all three of these vase paintings a bird is borne on the back of a dolphin. The writer of the dissertation accepts Galli's theory that the scene represents the journey of the soul (the bird) to Elysium.

The sixth chapter is an examination of the legends, myths, and folk stories recorded in literature. In nearly all of the legends the rôle of the dolphin is that of a carrier of human beings, of nymphs, of Erotes, and also of the dead. The latter function, according to Usener (*Sintfluthsagen*), quoted by Miss Stebbins, furnished the early Christians the fish as the symbol of the carrier of the soul, while the Erotes, riding the dolphins, were transformed into cherubs. The myths relating to the dolphin in connection with Apollo Delphinus, Dionysus, Poseidon, and Aphrodite are also examined.

The seventh and final chapter is a discussion of the dolphin in the art of the historical periods of Greece and Rome. In painting it was a stock decoration of burial receptacles. In sculpture the legends receive a little larger share of attention. Several representations of them in Greek sculpture are now known to us only by literary references. Important among the existing ones is the relief on the Choragic monument of Lysicrates, showing the transformation of the Tyrrhenian pirates into dolphins. The use of the dolphin in a vertical position, standing on its head (or mouth), as a statue support, is discussed, and a theory advanced as to the probable origin of the convention.

Among the Romans the use of the dolphin figure was varied. It appears as architectural decoration; also on coins, gems, and in mosaics; it was used as fountain decoration and as waterspouts, just as it is today, despite the fact



that it was a symbol of the sea—salt water and undrinkable. It was conspicuous in the Roman circus, where seven dolphin figures were balanced at either end of the *spina*, and used to indicate to the spectators the progress of the race, a dolphin being turned down as each lap was run.

The small number of representations of dolphin legends in art, from first to last, is surprising considering the number of myths and legends and the intimate, human element present in nearly all of them. The myths involving the gods are, as a rule, merely suggested by a dolphin held in the hand or in some way indicated as an attribute of the divinity.

The dissertation has no definite thesis, its object being to collect and describe examples of dolphin representation, and to cite literary references. This work is, of necessity, catalogical, and if the writer has devoted an overamount of space and attention to mere conventions in rendering the dolphin, and to the idiosyncracies of individual artists, the fault is not peculiar to this dissertation, but is common to all those dealing with like subjects and sources of information.

LILLIAN M. WILSON

CHICAGO

---

*The Composition of Homer's Odyssey.* By W. J. WOODHOUSE. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Price 12s. 6d.

Controversy, it has been said, equalizes fools and wise men and the fools know it. Something of the same effect is produced by the vastness of contemporary "literature" on every subject. Publishers blurb, reviewers flatter or slate, and the public cannot discriminate. One analysis of the *Odyssey* is as good as another to the man in the street, and a sober scholar will be inclined to distrust them all. It is pleasant, then, to be able to say that Professor Woodhouse's book is not just one analysis of the *Odyssey* like another. It does not, for example, bear the least resemblance to that in which Professor Wilamowitz demonstrates that the first book is a pitiful piece of patchwork and that anyone who maintains that the poem as a whole is the construction of a single supreme artist is an intellectual noncombatant on whom no serious investigator will waste his arguments.

Professor Woodhouse has evidently made a lifelong intelligent study of the *Odyssey*, and his distance from large libraries or perhaps his distaste for polemic is, it may be, an advantage for this task. It concentrates his attention upon the poem itself. He exploits no startling paradox: He puts all his cards on the table; he does not misinterpret or strain the evidence. He himself would admit that some of the details of his theory of the composition of the *Odyssey* are at the best probabilities. But his method is sound, and his argument is accompanied and reinforced by a penetrating criticism of the beauties and the structure of the poem which retains its value apart from all philological hypotheses.

The *Odyssey* as we have it, he holds, is the composition of a single literary artist; "that is only another way of saying that the *Odyssey* on the constructive

side is wholly Homer's work" (p. 219). The relation of Homer to his sources and predecessors is (the illustration is mine) that of Shakespeare to "Shakespeare's library." But Homer's "library," written or oral, is lost. And we are compelled to infer the use he made of it by indications in the poem itself. This is in a way the method of Dietrich Mülher, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*.

But Professor Woodhouse makes a much more intelligent use of it in my opinion, and he falls into none of the absurdities into which it seduces Mülher. He starts from the fact that the proem of the *Odyssey* fits the story which follows much less exactly than does the proem of the *Iliad*. Its plot is much more complicated. Odysseus' narrative of his adventures, the device of harking back, gives us both the past and the present; the interweaving of the tale of Telemachus gives us two sets of contemporary events.

In the *Iliad* the personages are not doing anything, nor do we feel that they are doing anything when they are not visible. . . . In the *Odyssey* . . . we have an impression of constant simultaneous activity. . . . When the brilliant idea of retarding the return of Odysseus until Telemachus should be of an age to take part in the action flashed upon the poet's soul the *Odyssey* was born into the world.

The poem moves in two worlds, the post-war real world of the return from Troy and the kingdom of Odysseus, and the fairyland of Greek fancy past proverbial Maleia. It blends in one artistic whole a number of folk-lore motives, such as "the return of the husband," "the woman's wit or playing for time," "the grass widow or the nick of time," "the loyal retainer," with the saga of Odysseus and early Greek deep-sea yarns.

There was no *Odyssey* before Homer, and there were no complete poems which he simply "contaminated" as a Roman dramatist combined a play of Menander and a play of Philemon.

What Homer did was to construct his story out of traditional motives, material, and to some extent verses. Despite the admirable art with which this was done, we are able to divine how he used the pre-existing elements and what he added of his own invention. He invented, for example, the education and quest of Telemachus, and the story of Calypso, the colorless replica of Circe.

The detail of Professor Woodhouse's analysis of the *Odyssey*, his account of the problems that faced the poet in the combination of these elements, and how he solved them, must be sought in his book. The book is well worth reading. Apart from the main thesis there is much illuminating literary criticism. Professor Woodhouse writes pleasantly, and in the concluding page of the final chapter eloquently:

I have called the *Odyssey* one of the most wonderful and precious things in the world. And what of Homer, "Maker" of the *Odyssey*? Well, to us the *Odyssey* is Homer. For the name of Homer must be to us very largely a symbol—a symbol for just what we find in his work. And we shall find there all that we look for, and more. It is curious that another great "Maker," himself also unsurpassed in his own art, should resemble Homer in this respect. The name of Pheidias also is, for

us, mainly a symbol, of a certain supreme spirit or phase of plastic art. But that does not mean that one harbours even the least doubt about the reality or personality of either Pheidias or Homer. It is hard to speak as one would of either of them. We barbarians of the West, for whom, as it has turned out after all, Pheidias wielded magician's chisel and Homer smote his immortal lyre, we who have been privileged to reap where we have not sown and to enter upon joint inheritance of their work, do not readily speak freely of what means very much to us, personally and individually. And whatever was said, one's words, though meant sincerely, would possibly sound a little formal, a little distant and impersonal, or perhaps even more than a little hackneyed. There is the fear always, lest in trying to do justice to the artist one should succeed only in appearing to plume oneself on some superior insight, or sensibility out of the common.

PAUL SHOREY

*The Σ Rhapsody of the "Iliad."* Annotated by ALEX PALLIS. Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1930. Pp. 107.

The book—a novel text of Σ with notes to justify it—is not to be taken too seriously. The author's thought about language is at the core purism of the eighteenth century. Consequently he knows how the Homeric poems ought to have been written; but, like other purists, he often finds the facts not in accord with his theories. That dilemma has been solved in dealing with English writers simply by denouncing "even the best" of them as ignorant; fortunately for our author it is not necessary to treat Homer in the same fashion. There are copyists and interpolators to whom the blame can be shifted; and then it can be maintained that Homer did write as he ought to have written, and his works can be presented in their pristine glory. There is but one fly in the ointment: the metre interferes with the good work. However, a hypothesis that tribrachs can be used for dactyls and iambs for spondees *ad libitum* disposes quickly of that trouble.

Some specimens of the author's views about the Homeric language follow:

At line 14: "A papyrus fragment gives *ἴναι*<sup>1</sup> which I think is truly Homeric as an alternative form to *ἴμεναι*; cf. *ἴμεναι—εἴναι, δόμεναι—δοῖναι*" and other examples equally to the point.

At line 36: "There ought to exist no doubt that *-εσσαι* is but a clumsy rhythmic expedient. It is a fact that it appears in inscriptions, but too much importance need not be attached to this." The writers of the inscriptions had learned to write from texts of Homer in which the forms in *-εσαι* had been falsified to *-εσσα*, in order to turn tribrachs into dactyls.

At line 94: "It ought to be clear that *ἔειπον* <for original *ἑειπον*> has been intruded from the Attic *εἶπον*, which form is accountable for by the fact that after the loss of the digamma the resultant *ἔειπον* was contracted. If not, then by what process could the vowel in the homeric root *εει* (cf. *εἶπος*) be lengthened?"

<sup>1</sup> According to Ludwig *ἴναι*. If this is not a slip for *ἱέναι* as read in another papyrus, it is the intrusion of the late form *ἴναι*.

At line 404: "φοιδεν. So Payne Knight <but over a century ago> in accordance with φοῖδα. MSS ἦδεν, which being digammatized introduces an augment within the root; how can that be?"

One cannot deal with the Homeric text unless he has a knowledge of historical Greek grammar and the principles of linguistic science; and the author of the present book gives no evidence that he has endeavored to acquire either.

The book is headed by a quotation calling attention to the slowness with which new ideas are absorbed. Peculiarly appropriate.

G. M. BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

*Die Caesurenfolgen des letzten Bearbeiters im Homer als Spuren seiner Compositions-kunst.* By HEINRICH TRÜBER. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1930. Pp. 96.

In this brochure the author announces a discovery of the principle on which our *Iliad* was put together by a *Bearbeiter* who in the sixth century B.C. composed an official version for use at the Panathenaic games. This principle is based on the position of the main caesura. The author claims to have discovered that the varying combinations, in successive verses, of the four caesurae, penthemimeral, third trochaic, hephthemimeral, and bucolic, divide the poem into rhythmical units which correspond to the smaller units of thought. Sequences of five or more verses are the work of the *Bearbeiter*. Those of three or four verses are traditional; they are, as it were, excerpts from the sources. These traditional sequences, which are frequently separated by one hundred or a multiple of one hundred verses, are used to mark important divisions of the episodes. They indicate the skeleton outline which the *Bearbeiter* made from his vast store of original lays.

The author has reared with enormous labor a towering structure of amazing conclusions, but he has utterly failed to provide it with a secure foundation. He neither states nor defends the principle which guides him in fixing the place of the main caesura, and his analyses of A and T awaken no confidence in the certainty with which he has located this caesura. In some verses he seems to be guided by a pause in sense, in others not, e.g. (pp. 9, 13, 10):

A239 ἄλκ' ἐπὶ οἷ μεμαῶς ὥς τε λῆς, || ἐκ δ' ἄρα χειρὸς  
240 σπάσσατο· τὸν δ' ἄορι || πλῆξ' ἀχίνα, λῦσε δὲ γυνῆα.  
486 στῆ δὲ παρὲξ· Τρῶες δὲ || διέτρεσαν ἄλλυδις ἄλλος.

If the main caesura is determined by a decided pause in sense, as in verse 239, why is not either the first diaeresis or the bucolic to be preferred to the penthemimeral in verse 240, or the triemimeral to the third trochaic in verse 486? If, on the other hand, a pause in sense does not determine the main caesura, as it does not in verse 240, why is not the penthemimeral chosen in verse 239, and what determines the choice between the third trochaic and the bucolic

in verse 486? What evidence is there that it is possible to know with certainty where the early bards placed the 'main' caesura?

The author follows Bethe in his theory of the *Bearbeiter*; he should have followed him also in regarding the first diaeresis and the triemimeral as main caesurae (*Homer*, I [1914], 37). The failure to recognize these, and others, as 'main' caesurae is due to the persistence of the ancient doctrine of the caesura. This doctrine arose more than five hundred years after the time of the hypothetical *Bearbeiter*. The doctrine is not based on the practice of the reciters of Homer; it is confused and altogether unsatisfactory (the reviewer has discussed the evidence in *AJP*, XL [1920], 343-72). Before the position of the main caesura can be used as the basis for conclusions about the composition of the Homeric poems a consistent and reasonable theory of caesura must be established.

In his analysis of the thought of A and T the author is quite as unconvincing. The 'discovery' cannot be recommended to students of Homer, except as a curiosity.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT  
BURLINGTON, VT.

---

### BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere biographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

*Beati in Apocalipsin, Libri Duodecim*. Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS.

"Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome,"  
Vol. VII. American Academy in Rome, 1930. Pp. xxiv+657.

The history of the Revelation of John in Spain is peculiarly interesting, for the Visigothic invaders did not include it in their New Testament, and it was necessary for the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 to insist upon its place in the canon. The Spanish monk Beatus, noted for his resistance to the Adoptionist heresy, produced a Latin commentary upon the book in 776, issuing a second edition in 784 and a third in 786. The text was printed in Madrid in 1770, but hardly a dozen copies of this printing are to be found today. There are twenty-four manuscripts, however, and from a careful study of them Professor Sanders has produced this stately printing of the author's third edition. There is a full account of the manuscripts, with facsimile pages of four of them, and an ample apparatus of readings. In the biblical quotations Professor Sanders detects the use of an Old Latin text.

Beside the ancient sixth- and ninth-century commentaries of Andreas and Arethas of Cappadocia we can now place the great work of their Spanish colleague Beatus, in this admirably critical edition, the product of immense industry and great palaeographical skill.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

*Arrian: with an English Translation*, Vol. I. By E. ILIFF ROBSON. "Loeb Classical Library Series." London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929.

The first volume of Mr. Robson's translation of Arrian contains Books I-IV of the *Anabasis* of Alexander. In a short prefatory note the translator discusses the text, the life of Arrian and his reliability as a historical authority, the troops and tactics of Alexander, and the author's terminology. The translation was made from Dübner's text (ed. Didot), checked by reference to the more recent edition of Roës. The editor is extremely conservative in his treatment of the Greek text, very rarely and only in the case of minor readings departing from the manuscripts and rejecting all attempts that have been made to "Atticize" the language and style of his author.

Explanatory notes on the text are few—too few, one might say. The general reader—and surely the Loeb Library is intended not only for scholars—would have welcomed short notes on the *Paralus* (p. 239), on the less familiar historical personages, on all the more unusual geographical names. It may be true that "Alexander's routes are for the most part easy to follow in any serious atlas" (p. xv), and yet a small outline map would have added to the convenience of the book. One does not always read with an atlas at his elbow.

The translation is accurate and readable, and, in the case of an author like Arrian, this is certainly all that can be asked of a translator. The subject matter is interesting and, since the work has been more or less neglected even by scholars, it is well that it has been made available in such attractive form for a wider circle of readers.

C. G. LOWE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

*Procopius: with an English Translation*, Vol. V. By H. B. DEWING. "Loeb Classical Library Series." London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

The latest volume of Mr. Dewing's translation of Procopius brings the final chapters of *The History of the Wars*. It contains the second half of Book VII, which takes up the story of the Gothic War with the siege of Rome by Totila in 549, and Book VIII, a general account of the operations of the Byzantine armies both in the West and in the East. The history comes to an end with the year 554.



Thanks to the work of such scholars as Krumbacher, Diehl, Bury, and their followers, the history of the Byzantine Empire is beginning to win the attention it deserves. Students of mediaeval history now realize that the Eastern Roman Empire played a rôle in the development of civilization that has too long been underestimated, and they are beginning to turn their efforts more and more to the study of Byzantine history. Unfortunately, for many of them Greek is no longer an available tool and therefore scholarly and accurate translations of the sources are badly needed. Most of the Late Greek historians and chronographers lie beyond the scope of the Loeb Library, and for many of them the establishment of a sound text must precede any attempt at translation. This is not the case with Procopius; Haury has supplied the critical text, and Mr. Dewing is giving us an admirable translation.

Not only will the historian be able to use the translation with the utmost confidence, but any reader who wishes to acquaint himself with a very important period of world-history can find no better introduction than this version of Procopius, the historian of Justinian and his time.

C. G. LOWE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

*Dio's Roman History: with an English Translation*, Vol. IX. By EARNEST CARY. "Loeb Classical Library Series." London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927.

With Volume IX Mr. Cary brings to a conclusion his translation of Dio. The present volume contains Books LXXI-LXXX, which cover the period from Aurelius (161 A.D.) to Alexander Severus (229 A.D.). For these books we possess only the epitomes of Xiphilinus and Zonaras, and the text, especially in Book LXXIX, is in so wretched a condition that it defies reconstruction. Mr. Cary naturally does not attempt to give in his translation a continuous version of such passages. Otherwise the translation maintains the same high standard set by the earlier volumes. Volume IX also brings the General Index so indispensable in a work of this type. As far as the reviewer was able to test it, the Index is accurate and complete.

The translator is to be congratulated on having so successfully completed a long and arduous task. By his scholarly version of an important source for the history of the Roman Empire he has put under obligation all friends of the classics.

C. G. LOWE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

*Declamatio in L. Sergium Catilinam*. Edited by HANS KRISTOFERSON. Goteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1928.

This doctoral dissertation is an excellent critical edition of the pseudo-Ciceronian fifth oration against Catiline. Kristoferson studied some twenty-



five manuscripts as against two used by the last editor, Zimmerer (1888). The Introduction (in Swedish) gives a detailed description of the manuscripts but does not discuss matters of style and authorship. Following the text there is a long list of parallel passages, a critical commentary, an Index Nominum, and an Index Verborum.

B. L. ULLMAN

---

*Johannis Antonii Campani de vita et gestis Braccii.* Edited by ROBERTO VALENTINI. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1929.

This book belongs to the revision of Muratori's great work, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, which has been under way for some time and deserves at least a brief notice here. The present fascicles, which constitute Tomo XIX, Parte IV, fascicles 1-2, of the new Muratori, give Campano's biography of Braccio, one of the interesting *condottieri* of fifteenth-century Italy. The work was finished in 1458, and Valentini has found two manuscripts written in that year. But he has based his edition mainly on a manuscript written in 1459, for this reveals Campano's final revisions.

The Introduction examines briefly but critically the value of Campano's account and concludes that he is reliable in detail though not always trustworthy in his analysis of motives. There are full historical notes as well as a critical apparatus. It is to be hoped that all the volumes of the new Muratori will reveal as great an improvement over the original as this one.

B. L. ULLMAN

---

*Maphaeus Vegius and His Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid.* By ANNA COX BRINTON. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1930. \$7.50.

Maffeo Vegio was a well-known fifteenth-century humanist who wrote an additional book for the *Aeneid* in order to bring out clearly that in the end Aeneas received his due reward by being taken to heaven. The book was usually printed with the *Aeneid* until well in the seventeenth century. Its great popularity was due to the interest in the allegorical interpretation of the *Aeneid*.

The volume under review is a beautiful piece of bookmaking. The detailed Introduction gives an excellent account of Vegio. This is followed by the text, reprinted from the *editio princeps* of 1471. On opposite pages is the English translation by Twyne, published in 1584. Next comes the Scotch version of Gavin Douglas (first printed in 1553), a bibliography, and a commentary (chiefly parallel passages).

The practice of reprinting humanistic works which have not been published in many years is highly commendable, but the growing custom of using as a basis an early printed edition must be halted. Vegio's poem was written in

1428—forty-three years before the *editio princeps*. In that time many corruptions and wilful alterations may have occurred. The new edition should have been based on the oldest and best extant manuscripts. If the chief interest were in Twyne's translation, the printed edition of the original which he used might properly be adopted for the basic text, but that printed edition was probably not the one of 1471.

B. L. ULLMAN

*Mediterranean Studies: I. The Genesis of European Alphabetic Writing; II. Minoan Seals.* By GEORGE HEMPL. Edited by FREDERICK ANDERSON. "Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature," Vol. V, No. 1. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1930.

It was hardly an act of kindness to the late Professor Hempl to publish these fragmentary studies at this time. The study on the alphabet takes into account none of the vast literature published after 1916. The important Sinaitic inscriptions, which almost all scholars consider Semitic, are dismissed by Hempl in a footnote as Greek in language and Minoan in script. The main thesis of the paper is that the Minoan script was acrophonic (in the sense that a character represented either a letter or a syllable), that Cyprian syllabic script developed out of Minoan, that another syllabic descendant of Minoan, used by a people speaking "Javonian" Greek, developed into the Greek alphabet, that this alphabet then passed to the Phoenicians who later passed it back to the Greeks. The letters of the alphabet are traced back to Minoan by Hempl on the acrophonic basis. For this purpose he assumes that Minoan was Greek, an assumption which is developed somewhat in the second paper on *Minoan Seals*. Thus Hempl derives the form of the letter alpha from the Minoan figure of a plow, and its value from the first letter of the Greek word for "plow," *ἄροτρον*. The upsilon is derived from a Minoan trowel, called *ὑπαγωγεύς* in (Minoan?) Greek; sigma is from a snake, called *σίκρα* in Hempl's Greek. Those scholars who thought Hempl's method and results impossible and absurd fifteen years ago will see no need to alter their views.

An example of Hempl's method in reading Minoan seals is furnished by his interpretation of a seal on which are engraved a door(?), leg, spider, and dog. The Greek words for these are *θύρα, ποὺς, ἀράχνης, κύων*. The first "syllables" of these words yield *tu-pos-ar-ku*, in classic Greek, *τύπος ἀρχοῦ*, "seal of the chief."

These studies are to be followed by Professor Hempl's discussions of Hittite, Etruscan, and Venetic.

B. L. ULLMAN

*A Handbook of the Latin Language.* By WALTER RIPMAN, M.A. London: J. M. Dent & Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1930. \$3.55.

This elementary book hardly falls within the province of this journal. But I may express my personal opinion that it will be useful to those who wish to learn or revive a little Latin without a teacher, and may be profitably used by secondary students and undergraduates to lessen the waste of time caused by the consultation of a larger lexicon in the rapid reading of ordinary Latin texts. The 526 pages of the vocabulary contain on a rough estimate some 7,500 words in comparison with the approximately 17,000 words of the Allen *General Vocabulary of Latin* (1874). It gives, however, incomparably more information—marked quantities, apt translated quotations from the Latin writers, and cross-references to a sort of Roget's thesaurus or classified vocabulary of Latin which in fifty subdivisions occupies pages 531–662. The brief, simple, but clear grammar that follows will be a convenience for those for whom the book is intended.

PAUL SHOREY

